

A K Davis

Leningrad, USSR

Sept. 1980

N. B. Bikkenin
**socialist
ideology**



Progress Publishers

Moscow

Translated
from the Russian
by Yuri Sviridov

Designed by Inna Borisova

Наиль Бариевич Биккенин

СОЦИАЛИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ИДЕОЛОГИЯ

На английском языке

CONTENTS

FROM THE AUTHOR	5
Chapter 1. THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CONSTRUCTING THE SCIENTIFIC THEORY OF IDEOLOGY	13
1. The Social Nature of Ideology	13
2. The Social and Gnoseological Aspects of Ideology	39
3. Ideology as a Factor of Social Action	54
Chapter 2. THE LENINIST CONCEPT OF SCIENTIFIC IDEOLOGY. PROBLEMS OF METHOD AND CONTENT	63
1. The Revolutionary-Critical Essence of Socialist Ideology	66
2. Theory, Propaganda, Practice	84
3. The Socialist Consciousness and the Experience of the Masses	92
4. The Character of Ideology and Types of Propaganda	100
Chapter 3. SCIENTIFIC IDEOLOGY IN A DEVELOPED SOCIALIST SOCIETY	120
1. The New Conditions of Ideological Activity	120
2. The Ideological Aspects of Economic Development	127
3. The Ideological and Moral Problems of the Socialist Way of Life	141
4. Ideology and Cultural-Historical Tradition	157
5. The Struggle of Ideologies and International Detente	174
6. The Deepening of the Spiritual Crisis of Bourgeois Society and Its Ideology	186
CONCLUSION	202

© Политиздат 1978

© Издательство Прогресс, 1979
с изменениями

English translation of the revised
Russian text

© Progress Publishers 1980

Printed in the Union
of Soviet Socialist Republics

Б 10504—549
014(01)—80 47—80

0302020000

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FROM THE AUTHOR

Ideology is the science of ideas. The term "ideology" and this definition are associated with the name of Destutt de Tracy, the French enlightener and man of letters who was the first to state that the world of social and political ideas constitutes a separate department of knowledge in its own right which follows a logic of its own, and has its own principles and rules, i.e., far from being a chaotic jumble of opinions it is subject to a set of definitive laws.

If it is true to say that philosophical categories and scientific concepts have destinies of their own we may safely say that the term ideology has had quite an exciting evolution.

Having appeared at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, in the middle of a turbulent revolutionary era the notion of ideology, far from getting lost in the veritable flood of philosophical and social ideas has, on the contrary, established itself firmly in the scientific vocabulary and entered the realm of contemporary philosophy, science and culture. Today ideology is one of the more frequently used terms in the philosophical and political vocabulary without which it would be impossible to assess and analyze the turbulent political and spiritual life of the 20th century. No philosophical or political doctrine claiming the serious attention of public can do without the term "ideology". Naturally, the first question the reader would want to ask is why this should be so, what motives and reasons of the socio-political and scientific nature are behind this phenomenon.

The author would like to draw the reader's attention to the following circumstances which may help him understand better why this book has been written. Together with the author the reader will explore the complex world of philosophical categories and notions which are noted for a high degree of abstraction, and generalization. However abstract and detached in a philosophical sense these notions may appear at first glance, their theoretical interpretation and analysis have a bearing on the most pressing and topical issues of everyday life and enter the world of the daily thoughts and reflections of men on their own destiny and the destiny of the world, on the meaning of life and work, on the future of their children, on what mankind may have in store for it in the aftermath of radical social changes and scientific and technological upheavals. Every human being is far more "ideological" than he may realize. By taking a definite attitude to life, by doing what he is doing from day to day, by becoming involved in socio-political events occurring in the modern world—and it is increasingly more difficult for anyone to remain aloof from them—every human being, whether he realizes it or not, is guided by certain principles, keeps to a particular socio-political line and becomes a supporter or opponent of a particular social concept. Any concept relating to the development of society is ideological from A to Z even when its architects claim that they dissociate themselves from ideology.

The world of the 20th century is the world of revolutionary social rejuvenation, of momentous historical shifts and global problems, of brilliant triumphs of the human mind and reason, of science and engineering. The world of the 20th century is marked by irreconcilable class conflicts and contradictions, stark alternatives, great expectations, mankind's concern about and hopes for a better future and for averting the catastrophe of a new world war.

The depth and scale of social changes occurring in the world, the confrontation of the two social systems—socialist and capitalist—on the international scene, the continuing unfolding of the scientific and technological revolution, the increasing involvement of great masses

of people in revolutionary struggle, their growing awareness and conscious making of history, the steadily sharpening contradictions of modern capitalism, the scale of problems arising in the course of socialist and communist construction—these are some of the key factors which determine the role and place of ideology in modern social development, the qualitative changes in the functioning of ideological structures in society and the objective demands made on them.

The bastions of history have always been stormed with the help of advanced ideas. The role of ideology, as modern and recent history have convincingly shown, is far from being static. It is every bit as dynamic as the whole course of history and is a derivative of a great many social, political, economic and cultural factors.

Phenomena associated with the growing role of ideology receive a peculiar refraction in the social consciousness and practice of different classes; they are attracting the growing attention of philosophers, sociologists, historians and law experts. The interest in the theory of ideology, in its fundamentals has grown as has the interest in the nature and inner workings of ideological activities, and in their overall impact on social consciousness. Ideological concepts and guidelines in interpreting the scientific and technological achievements, moral values and cultural standards, and in evolving general social and economic theories have been gaining in importance.

Nowadays ideology and propaganda are the object of a close socio-philosophical analysis having become the scene of a sharp ideological confrontation. This is a thoroughly logical development for today's world is a world of struggling ideas between polarized bourgeois and socialist ideologies. The front lines of ideological battle pass through every crucial problem of our time. The ideological struggle reflects in a crisp focus the basic conflicts and contradictions of our era: the conflict between labour and capital, between socialism and capitalism, between peoples struggling for national liberation and imperialism, between the forces of peace, democracy and progress and the forces of war and reaction.

The current struggle for international detente has introduced new elements into the ideological confrontation in the world. The ideological situation which is taking shape under the impact of current international factors is characterized by a set of rather specific circumstances and does not repeat any of the preceding ideological situations. The war of ideas is becoming more complex as it acquires new aspects and dimensions which call for an in-depth theoretical analysis and for account to be taken of them in practical activities.

Ideology expresses all the principal features of the class and society of which it is the spiritual representative. Two basic lines of ideological development in the modern world represent two polarized ideologies—bourgeois and socialist. The author of this book is a Marxist and will maintain, argue, develop and defend his Marxist views and will engage in a polemic with non-Marxists. It should, perhaps, be added that no other set of concepts have ever been subjected to such fierce attacks, or been so falsified and deliberately distorted as the concepts of Marxism. And the fact that Marxist views leave no one indifferent is an indication of the tremendous historical significance and viability of Marxism-Leninism. The Theses of the CPSU Central Committee on Preparation for the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin emphasized: "Marxist-Leninist ideology is a consistent expression of the vital interests of the working class, of all working people being at the same time a scientific theory that has been vindicated by the experience of socialist construction and presenting an objectively true picture of the world and as such is a good guide to action."¹

Socialist ideology is a tool for gaining an understanding of real life in all its manifestations, complexity and contradictions. It does not lead men into the illusory world of subjective visions, social utopia and mirages. Its projection of the future world stems from the present and is scientifically sound.

The role and place of ideology in a socialist society are determined by its fundamental principles, by the

¹ *Questions of the Ideological Work of the CPSU. A collection of the more important decisions of the CPSU (1965-1972)*, Moscow, 1972, p. 283 (in Russian).

specific features of its life and the prospects of further development. Socialism as a social system can only function effectively on the basis of a good knowledge of the social and economic processes involved, on the basis of scientific ideology, through the conscious creative efforts of millions. Socialist society has no need therefore for any mystification of its principles and its ideology has no use for myths and illusions. Lenin stressed: "We must not create illusions or myths for ourselves; this would be entirely incompatible with the materialist conception of history and the class point of view."¹

Constant attention to problems of ideology is a Marxist-Leninist tradition in the field of scientific analysis of reality. Lenin provided a clear definition of its substance when he wrote: "...socialism, as the ideology of the class struggle of the proletariat, is subject to the general conditions governing the inception, development, and consolidation of an ideology; in other words, it is founded on the sum-total of human knowledge, presupposes a high level of scientific development, demands scientific work, etc., etc."² This multi-dimensional, many-sided scientific work, the need for which Lenin emphasized, is being maintained by the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties.

The intensive elaboration of problems of socialist ideology has been occasioned above all by the tremendous scale of the creative tasks that face the socialist countries, by the need for a Marxist-Leninist interpretation and analysis of the current stage in the development of world socialism, the international workers' and national liberation movements, of all the world development. It has also been caused by the need for generalizing the latest break-throughs in science and engineering, the very essence and social consequences of the current scientific and technological revolution in the opposed social systems, and by the tasks involved in stepping up the well-reasoned attack on bourgeois, reformist and revisionist ideologies.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Victorious Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 450.

² V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to the Northern League", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 163.

Marxist-Leninist thought took the lead in raising and resolving the crucial problems of the 20th century. Evidence of this is provided by the political documents of the CPSU and the works written by the General Secretary of the CC CPSU Leonid Brezhnev who devotes close attention to the scientific substantiation of the domestic and international policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state, to such human spheres of societal life as education and upbringing, science, culture, literature and the arts. The new Soviet Constitution, the constitution of a developed socialist society, represents an outstanding theoretical and political document of scientific communism.

The Party documents of the CPSU examine every aspect of the cardinal problems of ideology and ideological activities maintained by the CPSU and disclose the need for constantly enriching the substance of socialist ideology, for a systematic study of the form and method of ideological work and for the elaboration of its theoretical principles. Thus we witness an active and purposeful process of scientific research in the field of ideology and ideological activity with a view to raising its theoretical value and practical effectiveness.

Modern science is dominated by the comprehensive approach which is fully applicable to the science of ideology. The author defines the latter as a very special sphere of social knowledge which studies ideology as a specific social phenomenon and reveals the mechanism of its origin, the way it operates and spreads, along with its social nature, functions and methods of exerting its influence. While the author does not claim that this term fully covers the ground he hopes that use of this term will help define more clearly the format of the present book, the range of problems dealt with, its character and thrust.

Unlike books devoted to specific sociological problems the present work deals with the exploration of general theoretical and methodological aspects of ideology and ideological activity. The author has been guided by the fact that key, substantive problems of ideology and propaganda may only be resolved through a general theoretical analysis which is capable of providing

"an integral picture of our realities"¹ by using the cognitive "force of abstraction".²

In identifying the relation of general theoretical and specific sociological approaches to the study of ideology it is important to see their essential inter-relationship; the two approaches feed each other and any opposition of one to the other would be unjustified. Specific sociological studies may supply the answer to the question of how particular ideas function, what concrete demands are made on the substance and forms of propaganda and political education, and what is the "optimum mode" of operation of individual links in the ideological chain. At the same time we believe that for the most part these explorations have to do with the mechanism of propaganda. As for the actual putting forward of ideas which entail changes in the content of propaganda, the raising of new and re-interpretation of traditional, long-standing questions, this lies beyond the framework of specific sociological studies and requires an analysis in broad theoretical terms.

Lenin, always an implacable opponent of schematism and scholastic sophistry, strongly opposed any attempt to belittle the significance of truly theoretical knowledge under the pretext of "business-like approach" and "keeping in touch with practical matters". The 25th Congress of the CPSU emphasized, in the spirit of these instructions of Lenin's, that there is "nothing more practical than a good theory".³ Examples of such a general fundamental and broad theoretical approach to problems of ideology and ideological activity are provided by the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Socialist ideology obeys the general laws governing the origin and evolution of the ideological process. At the same time it is subject to its own set of laws which are peculiar to it as the scientific ideology of the working class and which determine its new historical tasks. Thus, as far as the overall design of the present work

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 296.

² Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, p. 19.

³ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1976, p. 57.

is concerned, the author has attempted to examine the Marxist-Leninist theory of ideology as a definite organic entity permeated, in Lenin's phrase, by "uniform principles". The book deals with the Leninist doctrine of scientific ideology as the direct and creative elaboration of the seminal views of Marx and Engels on ideological processes, with the two polarized concepts of propaganda—the bourgeois and the socialist ones, and with the basic internal and international ideological aspects of life in a fully developed socialist society.

In defining the subject matter of the present book in this way the author took into account the fact that ideology is both a theoretical system and a social agent actively involved in the historical process. In this view a socio-philosophical analysis of ideology would be incomplete unless it also covered the methods of its functioning and exercising its influence on social consciousness. In other words, ideology and propaganda are looked at in an organic unity and not separately one from the other. Ideology determines the content and type of propaganda while the latter gives ideology a concrete social mechanism for its reproduction on a mass scale and a method of functioning. In the present work the author will attempt to explore both comprehensively.

Western sociologists have developed many schematic models of ideology which describe, classify and identify the matter dealt with. Therefore a major task of a scientific study is to reveal their actual socio-political meaning and their concrete social role and to compare the Marxist and non-Marxist views on ideology. It is from this angle that the author proposes to analyze critically the bourgeois concepts of ideology and propaganda.

One final preliminary remark. Naturally, the author makes no claim to supplying answers to every question relating to the theoretical analysis of ideology and propaganda. The present work provides basic concepts and definitions. If it succeeds in generating interest and in prompting the reader to delve deeper into the Marxist view of ideology and problems of education, to find out more about the practical experience of existing socialism in moulding the man of the new world, the author would consider that his mission has been fulfilled.

Chapter 1

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CONSTRUCTING THE SCIENTIFIC THEORY OF IDEOLOGY

1. The Social Nature of Ideology

The objective laws governing the origin, development and spread of ideology have been disclosed and defined by Marx and Engels for the first time in the history of social thought. This was the discovery of the life of society as a new continent of knowledge open to effective exploration, the provision of reliable theoretical prerequisites for the study of ideological relations.

The entire range of problems of ideology was placed by Marx and Engels on the solid ground of the scientific analysis of socio-economic factors and class interests. In so doing they made it possible to raise in a scientific way the question of intellectual and moral prime-movers of the historical process. **Theirs, then,** was not a particular methodological version of the study of ideology and social consciousness but rather the elaboration of a fundamentally new social and gnoseological position which ensured the adequate explanation of these phenomena and the development of a scientific theory of ideology.

The construction of a general theory of ideology resulted from a detailed study of concrete ideologies, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ones, which revealed their content and specific features. The process of evolving a scientific theory of ideology proceeded parallel with criticism by Marx of all forms of illusory ideological consciousness. The category of ideology in Marxist philosophy and sociology was by no means in any

static, ready-made state but was continually developing as new facts about social practice and scientific advances became known.

The general prerequisites of ideology as a form of spiritual, intellectual production are rooted above all in the type of social being, in the socio-economic conditions and in the character of the era in question. At the same time specific features of class struggle, the degree of acuteness of social contradictions and, finally, the prevailing spiritual atmosphere which includes cultural and historical traditions, all leave their imprint on ideological forms. Suffice it to say that the first bourgeois revolutions were the nutrient soil both for French materialism and the Enlightenment as a whole and also for German classical idealism. However, the same basic problems of the era found differing reflection in the two ideological systems and these distinctions embodied the differences of concrete situations which had arisen in France at the end of the 18th and early 19th centuries and in Germany in the mid-19th century, and the significant differences in the political role of the French and German bourgeoisie.

The formation of ideological concepts in as much as they are determined by socio-economic conditions of being, is directly dependent on the nature of the intellectual material accumulated at a particular point in time, and on the level of knowledge and culture achieved. Thus the development of proletarian ideology would have been impossible without the preceding all-round critical intellectual work aimed at mastering the entire wealth of knowledge accumulated by mankind. The scientific character of socialist ideology has determined its creative critical attitude to the intellectual and spiritual legacy of the past. The advent of proletarian ideology implied the overcoming of all previous ideologies and thus represented a theoretical revolution in the realm of spiritual and intellectual life. At the same time the new ideology was a science and like all scientific knowledge was fed by a definite set of theoretical sources and had been prepared by the entire course of previous cultural progress of mankind.

The emergence of socialism as a science, i.e., scientific socialist ideology, coincided, by and large, with the

development of the general theory of ideology and was indissolubly linked with the raising and resolution of such fundamental questions of theory and knowledge as proving the social conditionality of consciousness, the development of the concept of science and spiritual production as a specific type of human activity and the identification of the role the subjective factor plays in the historical process.

To define the content of any scientific theory is to define the range of problems it deals with and the limits of the phenomena it covers. Applied to the theory of ideology as a specific form of social knowledge this general methodological principle covers such problems as the place and role of ideology within the system of social relations, special features of the functioning of ideological systems in different socio-economic structures, the cognitive and social functions of ideology. A scientific theory of ideology must also supply the answers to questions about the internal laws governing the development and mechanism of ideological processes, the correlative dependence between socio-political and ideological content of an ideological system, on the one hand, and the propaganda methods and forms of influence, on the other, the specific refraction of the ideological in the "practical" consciousness of members of society and such complex social phenomena as morality, ethics, art and literature.

While examining the history of economic thought preparatory to writing his *Capital* Marx remarked on the importance of identifying "the decisive phases of analysis" for an understanding of the content of a scientific theory.¹ The idea of the fundamental importance of the "decisive phases of analysis" goes beyond the framework of economic doctrines becoming a universal methodological principle in the study of the genesis of any social theory. One such "decisive phase" in the development of scientific theory is *The German Ideology* co-authored by Marx and Engels. This book is of cardinal importance for an understanding of the treatment of the problem of ideology by Marxism-Leninism.

¹ Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*, Moskau, 1941, S. 843.

Marx and Engels advanced the principle of materialistic historicism in the examination of all forms of ideology. They wrote. "...but we will have to examine the history of men, since almost the whole ideology amounts either to a distorted conception of this history or to a complete abstraction from it. Ideology is itself only one of the aspects of this history."¹ There is a clear indication here that all previous ideological forms of social consciousness were, on the one hand, an illusory, distorted reflection of the actual historical process and in this sense represented nothing but ideology. On the other hand, Marx and Engels treat the ideological as being synonymous with an *a priori* construction of a model of reality while ideology may be understood not as an entity but only as a definite aspect of actual history.

The thesis to the effect that "ideology is itself only one of the aspects of this history" is the corner-stone of the materialist view of social life applicable to every form of social consciousness and, above all, to ideological configurations. It should also be borne in mind that these definitions were developed by Marx and Engels not in "the cloistered academic atmosphere of university departments" but in the course of a very real ideological and theoretical struggle and these definitions were directly linked with the tackling of the quite practical political tasks that the founders of scientific communism faced.

Their most pressing political and theoretical task was to debunk the Young-Hegelian conception of history and historical action. The lessons of this criticism have retained their edifying value to this day. Young Hegelianism as an ideological and philosophical trend was the characteristic typology of petty-bourgeois consciousness both in terms of content and in terms of thinking. As Marx and Engels saw it, the proponents of the Young-Hegelian concept of social development "...have consequently only been able to see in history the spectacular political events and religious and other theoretical

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, Progress Publishers, Moscow, p. 29.

struggles, and in particular with regard to each historical epoch they were compelled to share the illusion of that epoch".¹

Marx and Engels exposed the roots of idealist historiography, of the voluntarist-subjectivist view of the world when "the verdict on history" is returned on the basis of "fancy" and "notions" of certain persons about their own activity and those "religious" or "political" motives which, as they see it, have guided them. This approach leaves aside an analysis of actual historical factors, real social trends which constituted the decisive driving force of historical progress and defined, in particular, the ideology, psychology and motives of the forces involved in the struggle. Marx and Engels have demonstrated the untenable nature of subjectivist constructions when "fancy", "notions" are initially passed for actual reality and then on this rickety foundation the actual course of events is artificially constructed. Thus the living tissue of history is covered with a cobweb of illusions and prejudice.

Marx and Engels took a fundamentally new approach to the analysis of distorted consciousness. It was not the first time that illusory constructions had become the target of criticism in the history of social thought. Even pre-Marxist philosophy pointed to the existence of this kind of consciousness when it opposed "the true and unclouded" to "the untrue" and false consciousness. Suffice it to point to Francis Bacon's *Novum Organum* which deals with idols and false notions that have pervaded human consciousness and become entrenched in it. Marx and Engels see the problem in a fundamentally new light—attempting to ascertain not only the gnoseological sources but also the socio-economic causes and class motives which generate and consolidate distorted forms of consciousness. Marx and Engels derive "the physiology of the spirit" from a careful analysis of the "anatomy of the society". Therefore, the more apparent the enigma of mystified consciousness is, the clearer the content of actual consciousness, the subject matter and range of problems of a scientific ideology become.

In criticizing distorted forms of consciousness Marx

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

and Engels considered it important to identify "the ideological premises common to all of them"¹ which take the form of a distorted reflection of social being in the minds of men. This distorted reflection is fixed and consolidated by the interests of the economically and politically dominant exploiting class in its ideology.

Thus an illusory consciousness betrays a dual disparity, as it were. The divergence between reality and its perception gives rise to a tragicomic contrast between the individual's imagination, and real action, between actual achievements and illusions of such achievements.² A materialist interpretation of history provides the first rational explanation to this disparity which is one of the mysteries and misfortunes of consciousness and *The German Ideology* is the beginning of this explanation.

The Young Hegelians, just as atheists and petty-bourgeois radicals, countered distorted consciousness with critical or "true" consciousness in the belief that in this way it would be possible to remove "fatal delusions" of the human mind. Marx and Engels, for their part, countered this progressist-enlightener view which relies exclusively on consciousness with a revolutionary practical view which presupposes action to change reality. The demystification of consciousness in this approach is thus effected in conjunction with a demystification of reality itself. In other words, in order to do away with illusory consciousness it is necessary to do away with the social system which generates, needs and perpetuates illusions.

Marx and Engels stripped petty-bourgeois radicalism of its halo and demonstrated that a radical nature of consciousness is not determined by phraseology, however world-shattering it might sound, but rather by the relation of that consciousness to reality. They wrote: "Since, according to their fantasy, the relations of men, all their doings, their fetters and their limitations are products of their consciousness, the Young Hegelians logically put to men the moral postulate of exchanging their present consciousness for human, critical or egoistic conscious-

ness, and thus of removing their limitations. This demand to change consciousness amounts to a demand to interpret the existing world in a different way, i.e., to recognise it by means of a different interpretation. The Young-Hegelian ideologists, in spite of their allegedly 'world-shattering' phrases, are the staunchest conservatives."¹

In contrast to the philosophical idealism and political conservatism of the Young Hegelians Marx and Engels saw the overcoming of the existing consciousness as a matter of overcoming a particular historical form of reality—bourgeois social relations of which it was the illusory manifestation. This basic materialist principle was formulated and introduced in *The German Ideology*. This is a revolutionary principle, a communist principle.

As for the radicalism of the Young Hegelians which they so vociferously proclaimed they "forget, however, that they themselves are opposing nothing but phrases to these phrases, and that they are in no way combating the real existing world when they are combating solely the phrases of this world".²

The achievements of the Young Hegelians in the sphere of "their critical activity" in the realm of consciousness were modest to say the least. They failed to overcome the "old" consciousness in any radical way since they themselves remained within its lap. And even their most categorical demand to replace the existing consciousness by another, critical one was unfeasible. Marx and Engels, in exposing the utopian nature of this demand, in effect approached one of the basic problems of the Marxist theory of ideology—finding out the conditions surrounding the production of ideas, the birth of ideology, a consideration of the prerequisites leading to a radical transformation of the mass consciousness. Marx formulated the new position in a classical aphorism in his celebrated *Theses on Feuerbach* when he pointed out that "the philosophers have... interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it".³

The attempt to change consciousness by means of a different interpretation of reality which the Young He-

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 28.

² See *Ibid.*

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

² *Ibid.*

³ K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 8.

gelians made, in effect, marked the start of bourgeois concepts of manipulating consciousness. The meaning of manipulation and its aim was to cut off man from reality, to make him escape complex problems of life, to confine consciousness within the alienated world of illusions and mystifications. Naturally, the Young Hegelians were no sycophants in the same sense present-day bourgeois manipulators of consciousness are, but even so their subjectivist-idealist concept of history and consciousness merely replaced one form of distorted consciousness—the feudal-religious one—by another—the bourgeois-secular one.

The wealth of ideas contained in *The German Ideology* goes far beyond the confines of a critique of the Young-Hegelian philosophy. While subjecting this philosophy to criticism Marx and Engels developed a scientific methodology for criticizing all manner of social utopias and ideological illusions, a methodology that enabled one to analyze in depth the objective social causes and gnoseological roots of their appearance and proliferation in the mass consciousness.

Historically, ideology arises together with an antagonistic society divided into opposing classes where mental work is separated from manual work. Ideology itself becomes the scene of class struggle; within the sphere of ideology men formulate their social conflicts and fight for their resolution.

Emerging together with ideology is an ideological apparatus, a new social institution of society designed to secure, with the help of organizational forms, the reproduction of the dominant ideology and the ideological relations it generates. The nature of this institution is determined by the prevailing system of socio-economic relations where each specific ideology has its own organization representing a social mechanism with a clearly pronounced class character and thrust. Ideological institutions are an integral component of society's political superstructure, whose main function is to secure the spiritual prerequisites of the dominant class's political supremacy.

Once it has arisen, an ideology acquires laws governing its internal development and its real connection with economic activity and politics is obscured, becoming increasingly more difficult to perceive. "Consciousness ... can

never be anything else than conscious being ... and the being of men is their actual life-process. If in all ideology men and their relations appear upside-down as in a *camera obscura*, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life-process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life-process."¹ This classical formula defines the basic methodological principles underlying the dialectical-materialist approach to the content of ideology.

Marx and Engels at this stage use the notion of ideology in a negative sense, employing it to define alienated consciousness, its illusory forms. However in characterizing illusory forms of consciousness they keep to the materialist line. Their analysis of pre-scientific forms of ideology proceeds from new positions.

No scientific concept arises in such a way that the form of its expression from the very first is fully adequate to its content. This fully applies to the theory of ideology. Needless to say, this circumstance could not but affect the development of categories and classification of the Marxist concept of ideology. The fact that Marx and Engels, while developing a scientific theory of ideology and creating the socialist ideology of the working class, did not refer to it as an ideology, is today being seized upon by anti-Marxists who are attempting to impute to the founders of scientific communism a negation of any ideology as positive knowledge. However Marx and Engels negated ideology not as social cognition but only as distorted, mystified and manipulated consciousness which arises from antagonistic social relations.

Marx and Engels provided a far-ranging review of the evolution of preceding ideologies, having thoroughly analyzed the evolution of classical bourgeois economic, socio-political and philosophical thought, showed the actual role played by its outstanding representatives and gave an exact and comprehensive description of its epigones. Drawing on a wealth of concrete material from the history of social knowledge they identified laws governing the internal development of ideology, its social functions and provided important generalizations.

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 36.

A distinguishing feature of Marx's method in the study of consciousness is the establishment of the social content of particular ideological forms as a reflection of particular social relations as well as the ascertainment of their historical meaning and their role in orienting the world outlook of men. Marx wrote: "It is, in reality, much easier to discover by analysis the earthly core of the misty creations of religion, than, conversely, it is to develop from the actual relations of life the corresponding celestialised forms of those relations. The latter method is the only materialistic, and therefore the only scientific one."¹ Naturally, we are talking here of the scientific method of studying all forms of ideology, not just religious concepts.

The fundamental importance of this problem springs also from the fact that its real content is treated rather arbitrarily by many philosophers and sociologists. Thus Karl Mannheim asserted: "To begin with, it could easily be shown that those who think in socialist and communist terms discern the ideological element only in the thinking of their opponents while regarding their own thought as entirely free from any taint of ideology."² From this an attempt is made to accuse Marxism of hypostosing itself into an absolute both with regard to preceding ideological concepts and with regard to its own content.

This attempt is not new. Many critics from the bourgeois, and particularly from the petty-bourgeois, camp have been levelling accusations ever since the advent of Marxism that Marxists were deifying the proletariat, treating it as something sacrosanct, while lending a messianic character to their ideology, describing it as an absolute and infallible truth in the last instance which needs only be declarative. Marx and Engels gave a fitting rebuff to this falsification when they stated bluntly in *The Holy Family*: "When socialist writers ascribe this world-historic role to the proletariat, it is not at all, as Critical Criticism pretends to believe, because they regard the proletarians as gods . . . It is a question of *what the proletar-*

iat is, and what, in accordance with this *being*, it will historically be compelled to do."¹

There is not an iota of messianism in Marxism, and never has been, not even in its formative period as a scientific ideology. In fact, Marxism opposes to the messianic principle—"this is the truth, kneel down to it!"—the principle of revolutionary action and struggle, the principle of scientific knowledge.

The problem of scientific soundness of ideological concepts can only be solved through a consistent implementation of the principle of materialistic historicism.

The reduction of the history of ideology to a gallery of human delusions and misconceptions is alien to Marxism. The preceding evolution of man's spiritual development from the Marxist point of view is more an Odyssey of human reason in its materialistic interpretation. A particular ideological concept expressed in the form of philosophical, socio-political, and economic knowledge should be looked at in its indissoluble link with the doctrines and theories which have preceded it.

The services historical figures have rendered to history are judged not by what they *failed to deliver* by current standards but rather by what *new things* they *produced* compared with their predecessors, by how they put to work the intellectual material available to them, by whether they were equal to the ideological and political challenges of their day. The ability and skill in making use of the fund of knowledge accumulated by mankind is a major index of the level of scientific standard and philosophical culture of any ideological concept. The appearance of Marxism which has absorbed all the greatest achievements and creations of human thought, which has critically analysed and generalized scientifically the evolution of knowledge over the two millennia of human history was a classical example of that ability.

Admittedly, the treatment of many problems of socio-philosophical knowledge in pre-Marxist ideology was limited and ideology did not become a science in its own right until the advent of Marxism. But to Marxists the history of ideology is the subject of criticism that explores

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 352.

² Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia. An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, London, 1936, p. 111.

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Holy Family". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 37.

rather than negates. The content of pre-Marxist ideology as expressed in philosophical, economic, socio-political and legal knowledge and in the form of social utopias cannot be reduced, as Marx and Engels showed, to a false consciousness, to an illusory view of the world. The social principles of classical bourgeois ideology oriented outstanding representatives of bourgeois social thought from Francis Bacon to Ludwig Feuerbach, from William Petty to David Ricardo and helped them to push the frontier of knowledge forward.

Nothing is more alien to the class spirit of Marxism-Leninism than an interpretation of spiritual values from the standpoint of vulgar sociology which leads to an inadmissible simplification of the complex and contradictory picture of cultural-intellectual progress, to a negation of the right to inherit real spiritual values. A consistent and uncompromising struggle against sociological primitivism is a Marxist tradition of long standing initiated by Marx and continued by Lenin.

Lenin in his remarks on V. Shulyatkov's book *The Justification of Capitalism in West-European Philosophy (from Descartes to E. Mach)* emphasized the absurdity and amateurishness of the author's attempts to derive complex philosophical categories of substance, matter, movement and the like, from an analysis of the class structure of bourgeois society and the organization of capitalist production. Criticizing the pseudo-scientific terminological jugglery of the author Lenin wrote: "Go ahead, lump everything together! idealism as well as scepticism, everything 'corresponds' to manufacture! Comrade Shulyatkov is simple, very simple."¹ That was simplicity of a kind that was, to use a popular phrase, worse than stealing, because it robbed human thought.

Plekhanov, a prominent propagator of Marxism, wrote sarcastically, in a transparent reference to Shulyatkov, that some people were inclined to interpret Marx's view of the history of philosophy roughly as follows: If Kant concerned himself with matters of transcendental aesthetics, if he spoke of categories of reason or antinomies of

reason, he had nothing but phrases. In actual fact, he took no interest in either aesthetics or antinomies or categories. All he wanted to do was to supply the class to which he himself belonged, i.e., the German bourgeoisie, with as many delectable dishes and beautiful concubines as he could. Categories and antinomies seemed to Kant to be a wonderful means for doing that, and he decided to deal in them.¹

Shulyatkovism which Lenin rightly qualified as "a caricature of Marxism in history" and which infuriated Plekhanov² became synonymous with vulgar sociology. The grotesque-comic forms which the latter acquired in Shulyatkov's writings do not make it harmless since vulgar sociology masquerades under the scientific authority of the Marxist class approach. It tries to speak on behalf of Marxism-Leninism and is thus capable of compromising Marxist methods employed for a scientifically sound study and evaluation from class positions of social phenomena, especially such complex cultural-historical values and structures as philosophy, literature and art. Lenin opposed to pseudo-scientific, pseudo-Marxist exercises of the Shulyatkov variety, the need for a concrete analysis of historical periods, formations and ideologies.

Illusions and myths which classical bourgeois ideologies shared should not be reduced to the wanderings and delusions of individual thinkers who failed to grasp something and fell short of thinking out something else. These illusions and myths were not only and not so much their personal fault, but rather the fault of a whole historical era, one marked by the break-up of feudal relations and the advent of the capitalist mode of production, by the appearance of nations and national states and world history.

One of the dominant ideas of classical bourgeois ideology which was advanced in the course of the struggle against the feudal reaction was the idea of natural man, the idea of natural law to which a true social system should correspond. This idea was developed by early bourgeois thinkers in every basic area of human endeavour—in evolving a new methodology of science, in phi-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "V. Shulyatkov, *The Justification of Capitalism in West-European Philosophy (From Descartes to E. Mach)*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 493.

¹ Georgi Plekhanov, *Selected Philosophical Works* in five volumes, Vol. 3, pp. 299-305 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*

losophy, in political economy, in the sphere of law etc. Both the strengths and weaknesses of the classical bourgeois world view in this matter are revealed with special clarity by the history of pre-Marxist economic doctrines. An excursion into the history of these doctrines enables one to trace the internal connection between basic principles of early bourgeois ideology and the concrete results of special economic studies made by the classical representatives of bourgeois political economy. This makes it possible to present the problem of the true and illusory in classical bourgeois consciousness as a whole, component by component.

In their special economic explorations the classics of bourgeois political economy were guided by methodological principles which had been evolved by the philosophy of a nascent bourgeoisie. The early English economists shared the basic principles of the philosophy of Bacon and Hobbes. Both the economists and the philosophers represented well a bourgeois ideology in the making.

The mercantilists were the first to elaborate the capitalist mode of production in theoretical terms. The mercantilists just as the representatives of classical bourgeois political economy who followed them, did not concern themselves with studying ideology as such. However, while analyzing and generalizing the laws governing the development of the capitalist mode of production in the making they played an active role in shaping classical bourgeois consciousness.

The doctrines developed by the mercantilists whose most prominent representatives included Stafford and Men of England, Montchrétien of France and Pososhkov of Russia, for the first time freed economic thinking from religious-ethical fetters. This was reflected in the changed approach to the study of economic phenomena which the mercantilists began to regard as natural ones. They tried to identify cause and effect relationships in economic life. However, they did not go beyond describing such relationships in rough outline basing themselves on such evidence as they could find without delving under the surface of capitalist production, in the manifestations of economic phenomena in the sphere of circulation.

Having formulated the causal approach to the study of economic phenomena the mercantilists took a step for-

ward compared with the scholastics of the Middle Ages. In this light their empiricism acquires an anti-scholastic trend and represents a substantial advance for economic thought.

The causal approach to the study of economic life, the recognition of the independent significance of its phenomena that the mercantilist school advanced were the first steps towards substantiating the *natural* character of economic laws. This represented one of the greatest contributions of classical bourgeois political economy to the scientific study of economic life, to the theoretical substantiation and development of basic principles of bourgeois ideologies which rest on the pillars of "natural" law.

The general principles of the study of science in the new era formulated by Francis Bacon such as the need to go over from a description of facts to an analysis of their internal relationships, the interpretation of a law as a substantial, necessary and recurrent internal relationship distinct from its external manifestation—these were applied more fully by William Petty, the father of classical bourgeois political economy.

William Petty was the first in the history of economic thought to break a path from external to internal relationships interpreted as a law of the existence of phenomena. Classical bourgeois political economy began to study the internal mechanism of bourgeois relations of production after Petty's pioneering studies. By applying the methodology of the philosophy of the modern age to the study of concrete economic material Petty identified a series of substantive relationships peculiar to capitalist production.

Within the physiocratic system which was bourgeois in terms of content and feudal in terms of external expression, the doctrine of the natural character of social life received a full-scale substantiation. In his examination of society from a naturalistic standpoint F. Quesnay concluded that the economic process had an internal content subject to regulation by immutable natural laws. The notion of the natural course of things which the physiocrats formulated with the utmost clarity was pitted against the voluntarist and theological interpretation of the laws of social life. This represented a significant and indisputable victory for bourgeois ideology.

Marx wrote: "It was their great merit that they conceived these forms as physiological forms of society: as forms arising from the natural necessity of production itself, forms that are independent of anyone's will or of politics, etc. They are material laws..."¹

The doctrine of the natural content of economic laws, although it represented a major scientific advance of social thought, was, however, limited. Its limitation lay in the anti-historicism and non-dialectical interpretation of what constituted a law and in many instances sprang from the overall general premises of bourgeois consciousness. The philosophy of the new era and classical bourgeois political economy which shared common social positions and methodology opposed the natural and the historical, identified the subjective with the variable, and saw the objective nature of laws in their immutability. A natural law for bourgeois thinkers is the eternal, immutable substance of permanent unchanging things. Thus they exaggerated the relative stability of a law to the point of its eternal immutability.

This anti-historical view which was the product of a narrow bourgeois ideological awareness led bourgeois economists to regard bourgeois production relations with the laws peculiar to them as eternal laws not subject to historical evolution. Marx pointed out: "...The error is only that the material law of a definite historical social stage is conceived as an abstract law governing equally all forms of society."²

The naturalist approach to the study of economic life eventually resulted in an idealist interpretation of the social process. In substantiating the natural content of economic laws the classics of political economy appealed to the natural origin of man which formed the common ideological platform of classical bourgeois consciousness. Its central figure was the individual with his natural abilities, faculties and needs. Natural laws, in their opinion, were an order of things which corresponded to the interests of the individual. The personal interest of an individual may be limited only by the personal interests

of other individuals, no other limitations should exist. This was the gist of a fundamental idea produced by classical bourgeois economic thought, an idea that had a clearly defined anti-feudal thrust which rejected the lawfulness of limitations imposed by feudal-estate relationships. The bourgeois view of the individual and society received its complete expression in the works of Adam Smith.

The role of Adam Smith in the evolution of the scientific view of the content of economic laws consisted in the fact that he derived the origin of economic phenomena not from the conscious agreement among men nor from the actions of political leaders and not even from Providence but from the spontaneous, day-by-day activities of individuals to meet their daily needs. An economy functions subject to the operation of natural laws in a spontaneous fashion, it comes into being as a result of the same set of mass actions repeating themselves.

Applied by the classics of the bourgeois political economy to an analysis of the capitalist society, the ideological and philosophical concept of the natural character of economic life despite its historical limitations produced a number of valuable concrete results. A case in point is Smith's analysis of the origin of money.

The doctrine of the natural content of economic phenomena developed by classical bourgeois political economy was the first attempt at applying the notion of natural law to an analysis of social life. The very idea of a natural course of economic life subject to inherent laws peculiar to it was progressive but its explanation and substantiation was unscientific. The natural content of economic laws was derived from the abstract nature of the individual, rather than from an analysis of the socio-economic relationships taking shape among men in the course of producing material goods. The nature of man was regarded as an eternal abstraction peculiar to a separate individual, and not as a totality of concrete historical social relations.

This led the classics of bourgeois political economy to deal with natural rather than natural-historical laws. They were compelled to lend to the former an eternal, supra-historical character. This anti-historical interpre-

¹ Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part I, Moscow, 1969, p. 44.

² *Ibid.*, p. 44.

tation of these laws implied in the realm of theory a perpetuation of the capitalist mode of production and was an expression of bourgeois ideological positions in science.

Since in substantiating the natural character of economic laws bourgeois political economists appealed to the nature of man they arrived at a naturalist view of society. That is why in their economic studies they focused their attention on the material side of production. Thus Ricardo examined cost, wages and profit only as quantitative values. Inasmuch as the laws of the capitalist mode of production were proclaimed to be eternal and supra-historical classical bourgeois economists did not inquire and did not even wonder why and under what conditions expended labour created value.

Thus, the doctrine of the natural character of economic laws was contradictory. Since it regarded economic phenomena as mutually connected, as spontaneous, occurring independently of human consciousness and politics this doctrine represented a valuable scientific breakthrough directed against voluntarist views. The idea of a "natural law" was a progressive achievement not only in the context of economic theory but for other departments of knowledge and culture as well. Its application to the study of social life produced ideas of the unity of the historical process and gave rise to humanist concepts.

However, the substantiation of the natural content of economic laws was metaphysical since they were regarded as the invariably permanent substance of invariable phenomena. It was also idealist since it was based on the abstract nature of man as interpreted by naturalists. Thus a vicious circle arose since the naturalist view of man (for all its sensory-visual concrete nature), an interpretation of society as a sum total of so many individuals, an interpretation that all pre-Marxian historiography shared, inevitably led in the realm of the theory of history of social atomism and political-ethical idealism.

Assessing this dual role of classical bourgeois political economy Lenin wrote: "...The classics sought and discovered a number of capitalism's 'natural laws', but they failed to understand its transitory character, failed

to perceive the class struggle within it. Both these faults were remedied by materialist historicism."¹

The progressive significance of the doctrine of the natural character of economic laws is evidenced by the fact that vulgar political economy advanced an anti-scientific critique of this rational kernel of the classics, seizing upon its metaphysical limitations. Vulgar political economists claimed that the concept of natural law had meaning only in the study of natural phenomena, that it was inapplicable to an analysis of social life since historical events by virtue of their individuality and non-recurrent nature cannot be squeezed into the framework of a general formula of natural laws.

Marxism accepted the rational content of the idea of natural law. Lenin wrote: "It is 'materialist historicism' that conclusively substantiated this idea, after stripping it of its metaphysical (in the Marxist sense of this term, i.e., anti-dialectical) absurdities and defects."²

Thus, a look at genuine historical-philosophical and economic material shows that nothing could be more alien to Marxism than trying to reduce preceding ideological concepts and doctrines to an illusory view of the world. At the same time their real content can only be rightly assessed and understood on the basis of a concrete analysis of the socio-economic and political structure of the period in question since this structure forms the real basis for the intellectual material out of which ideological constructions are put together.

In terms of method Marx's criticism of ideological illusions has always been geared to concrete historical circumstances. It had nothing to do with either a moralizing criticism or a criticizing morality but was directed at ascertaining their real content as a product of definite social relations, at establishing their actual role in the struggle of the classes, in the historical process.

There are illusions and illusions. The ideological illusions generated by the French revolution (1789-93), problems, principles and slogans formulated by its ideologists and politicians in one way or another expressed

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Socialism Demolished Again", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 197.

² *Ibid.*

an objective truth of history, real needs of the period and went in step with the pulse of the time and for this reason had the power of a historical truth. Marx's remark that the illusion of a class making a revolution is true, fully applies to the illusions of the French Revolution.¹ Illusions of this kind, Marx emphasized, form what is known as "the *tone* of each historical epoch . . ."² This conclusion is of fundamental importance for an understanding of the special character of an illusory consciousness.

The founders of scientific communism examined the "illusory nature" of bourgeois ideology component by component from different angles. Their remark on the possibility of "true illusions" indicates that an interpretation of ideology as "a distorted consciousness" in the context of the bourgeois consciousness should not be regarded as something static, linear and unhistorical. "Illusory nature" is a multi-dimensional notion and its magnitude varies depending on many different economic, social, political and spiritual factors. We cannot agree with the assertion that ideology is nothing but a pre-history of science, that later on ideological problems allegedly become dissolved in the findings of specialized scientific disciplines and for this reason possess no intrinsic value. At best, under this interpretation, it can only be a symptom of the presence of scientific problems. In other words, ideology is analogous with phlogistic chemistry applied to a social science while science becomes an ideology every time "it is tacked on to reality" without going through the process of active investigation and confining itself only to evaluative judgments.

An analysis of the methodology of the philosophy of the new era and the doctrines of the classics of English political economy convincingly shows that the valuable findings they made in their day had been achieved within the overall framework of the ideology of the bourgeoisie as a rising class, i.e., the ideological process was at the same time a cognitive process.

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 61.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Holy Family". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 81.

The principles of early bourgeois ideology stimulated the progress of science and in this sense this ideology unlike the ideology of the Middle Ages, religious ideology, contained a relative truth. Marxism rejects the concept of ideological relativism and subjectivism which bourgeois sociologists have been pushing, particularly since Karl Mannheim's day.

The scientific investigation of social phenomena is always conducted from definite ideological positions and its findings are expressed in forms of social knowledge. Therefore the question cannot be reduced to the dilemma "either ideology or science" as bourgeois philosophers and sociologists would have us believe. Rather, it is a question of finding out whether a particular ideology meets the objective requirements of historical development, whether it contributes to the progress of social knowledge, to the growth of "relative truths" and thereby to approaching "absolute truth", what social tendencies the class interest of a particular social group expresses and how this group relates to the chief tasks of the age.

Marxism has established that at different stages of social development bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, which is illusory on the whole, has different social roles to play. Thus during the collapse of feudalism between 1789 and 1793, unlike the situation in 1848 the petty-bourgeois consciousness had a distinct revolutionary character, was future-oriented and "...served the purpose of glorifying the new struggles, not of parodying the old; of magnifying the given tasks in imagination, not of fleeing from its solution in reality . . ."¹ This metamorphosis of the illusory consciousness was by no means the caprice of history. On the contrary, it was a legitimate change of roles since the social position of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois democracy had changed.

The advent and subsequent development of the scientific ideology of the working class radically altered the meaning of petty-bourgeois illusions. They lost the

¹ K. Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1971, p. 399.

right to historical justification, since in reality material and spiritual requisites were taking shape for a scientific formulation of ideological problems. Illusions at this point become a form of perpetuating prejudices. The historical drama of petty-bourgeois ideas degenerates into a farce.

The disintegration of the petty-bourgeois ideology was proceeding at an accelerating rate as its content degenerated into phraseology: from pseudo-radicalism and liberal speechifying to "revolutionarism" and "world-shattering" phrase-mongering.

Phraseology becomes synonymous with petty-bourgeois character, and expresses its theoretical and political surrender in the face of the formidable challenges of social tasks, it demonstrates a desire to flee from the complexity and contradictory nature of the historical process, to stand above the struggle of polarized ideologies, classes and social systems.

The dominance of the phrase over content, the elevation of trivialities into a mystery and wisdom, attempts to pass off the consciousness of a social group for universal values shared by all mankind, to pass off private interest for that of the rest of humanity, these are the unmistakable signs of the degeneration of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies.

Marx and Engels exposed the objective economic and social roots which make bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies acquire a mystified character. A mystified ideology corresponds to a mystified reality. The mystery of "commodity fetishism" begets the mystery of "illusory consciousness".

Social relations under capitalism are subject to mystification. Whereas in a feudal society relations of dominance and subordination had the form of direct personal dependence, under capitalism social relations among members of society take on a commodity-coloured character. This generates stable illusions in human consciousness. Realities are perceived in an inverted form, as it were. Marx showed just how images of freedom, equality and property take shape in the minds of members of a bourgeois society. "Freedom, because both buyer and seller of a commodity, say of labour-power, are constrained only by their own free will. They contract

as free agents, and the agreement they come to, is but the form in which they give legal expression to their common will. Equality, because each enters into relation with the other, as with a simple owner of commodities, and they exchange equivalent for equivalent. Property, because each disposes only of what is his own."¹

This illusion was also reflected in classical bourgeois political economy, only the latter did it, as Marx aptly put it, in a "naive and objective" way.²

As capitalism developed and its conflicts and contradictions became more aggravated the classical "objective" theories were replaced, quite logically, by an open apologia which no longer had even a scrap of "true illusions". Marx exposed the economic and social causes behind the crisis of bourgeois consciousness. He wrote: "The more the normal form of intercourse of society, and with it the conditions of the ruling class, develop their contradiction to the advanced productive forces, and the greater the consequent discord within the ruling class itself as well as between it and the class ruled by it, the more fictitious, of course, becomes the consciousness which originally corresponded to this form of intercourse (i.e., it ceases to be the consciousness corresponding to this form of intercourse), and the more do the old traditional ideas of these relations of intercourse, in which actual private interests, etc., etc., are expressed as universal interests, descend to the level of mere idealising phrases, conscious illusion, deliberate hypocrisy."³

This metamorphosis of bourgeois ideology from "true illusions" to "deliberate hypocrisy" marked the start of a crisis of bourgeois consciousness, was its first symptom. To quote Marx again: "It was thenceforth no longer a question, whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not. In

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 172.

² Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part 3, Moscow, 1975, p. 453.

³ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 293.

place of disinterested inquirers there were hired prize-fighters; in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic."¹

Vulgar political economy, that progeny of the bourgeois consciousness in crisis, reproduced the consciousness of the agents of the capitalist mode of production exactly as it took shape in the course of their day-to-day activities. Its paramount concern, as Marx put it, was how to translate these pedestrian ordinary notions "...into a doctrinaire language, but they do so from the standpoint of the ruling section, i.e., the capitalists, and their treatment is therefore not naive and objective, but apologetic".²

It is impossible to unravel the mystery of the illusory nature of consciousness, overcome the seemingly objective nature of phenomena without abandoning the bourgeois point of view, while remaining "immersed in bourgeois production". The fact that in the ordinary consciousness objective relations of capitalist exploitation and political domination are camouflaged is exploited not only by apologist bourgeois theories but in fact forms the basis of bourgeois propaganda which exploits the "semblance", "seeming nature" of bourgeois relations on the surface of phenomena.

The problem of the true and the illusory in ideological concepts was defined with sufficient clarity by Marxism through an analysis of utopian socialism. Marx, Engels and Lenin devoted a good deal of attention to the study of socialist and communist utopias in an effort to establish their place and role in history, their relevance to the ideas of scientific socialism. The result of their considerable efforts was that they formulated a series of fundamental principles which show the need to read social utopias in the context of the historical period in question. This approach makes it possible to decipher their meaning scientifically and separate the real from the illusory, the existing from the fantastic, the possible from the utopian.

The classical utopias of the socialist and communist variety were clear expressions of progressist-optimistic

concepts which were future-oriented. Those were concepts of a grand historical and social scale that captured the imagination. In terms of their place in history these utopias represented the ascending branch in the overall development of utopias. Their optimism and confidence in the future makes them differ radically from the reactionary utopias of the present day which have broken with the idea of progress and which are built on the principle that "the future will be worse than the present".

Classical socialist utopias were the first symptom of incurable social ills of bourgeois society in the social consciousness, a peculiar social diagnosis which showed that "something is rotten in the State of Denmark". But this does not exhaust their historical import.

Socialist utopias being the products of the creative imagination of great thinkers were a major step forward in mankind's pursuit of an ideal of just society. Having been generated by an outright rejection of the world of exploitation and violence, by a sincere compassion towards the oppressed and the downtrodden, utopias, as Engels put it, "anticipated innumerable things the correctness of which is now being scientifically proved by us...".¹ Although their social forecasts resembled dreams about the future, but those were the social dreams of titanic minds whose imagination contained shrewd visions of the shape of things to come. What is more, their visions of the future were inseparable from their sharply critical attitude to the bourgeois society of their day whose realities were in such stark contrast with the projections of bourgeois enlighteners. The bourgeois society of their day had little or nothing in common with the society of their dream.

The socialist utopians not only recorded this crying disparity between the expected and the actual reality, they were the first to discover in the embryonic capitalist relations the germs of future antagonisms and conflicts which began to grow as the capitalist mode of production advanced.

¹ F. Engels, "Preface to *The Peasant War in Germany*. Supplement to the Preface of 1870 for the Third Edition of 1875". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1977, p. 169.

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 25.

² Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part 3, p. 453.

Marxism has disclosed the real value of utopias by putting them in historical perspective. The value of social utopias lies in the inverse relationship to the actual historical process. This is the general law governing their internal evolution. This general sociological approach to social utopias indicates the way to their detailed study and evaluation.

A comparative analysis of two *simultaneous* utopias—peasant-Narodnik and bourgeois-liberal—was provided by Lenin who showed how utopias *differing* in terms of objective content and class role but occurring simultaneously have different social implications and meaning. To quote Lenin: "The Narodnik utopia plays a peculiar historical role. Being a utopia in regard to the economic consequences that a new division of the land should (and would) have, it is an accompaniment *and symptom* of the great, mass *democratic* upsurge of the peasant masses. . . . The liberal utopia corrupts the democratic consciousness of the masses. The Narodnik utopia, which corrupts their *socialist* consciousness, is an accompaniment, a symptom, and in part even an expression of their democratic upsurge."¹ This differentiated assessment of two simultaneous concurrent utopias in regard to democratic and socialist tasks that Lenin gave makes it possible to conclude that although the Narodnik utopia was a step back as compared with scientific socialism it still had a general positive meaning during the first Russian revolution of 1905—07 as it represented a step forward compared with the liberal utopia which corrupted not only the socialist but also the democratic consciousness of the masses. Lenin emphasized the importance for the Marxists to be able to pinpoint in the Narodnik utopia "the sound and valuable kernel of the sincere, resolute, militant democracy of the peasant masses".²

The Marxist-Leninist methodology of the analysis of utopian consciousness, in particular the conclusion about the possibility of a non-adequate expression of socio-historical content of ideological currents in their theoretical forms, is of great practical importance in the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Two Utopias", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 357.

² *Ibid.*, p. 359.

study of different present-day non-Marxist forms of socialism, for a better understanding of their real substance and social differentiation stemming from their heterogeneous and complex nature within the historical process.

2. The Social and Gnoseological Aspects of Ideology

In their analysis of the evolution of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois consciousness Marx and Engels identified a number of fundamental characteristics of the development of ideology: its changing character and content under the impact of changes in the objective status of the class of which it is the theoretical consciousness, the relationship between the ideologists and the class, the influence of contradictions within the dominant class on its ideology, and the overall tasks of ideology in regard to the class.

These conclusions and generalizations were made by Marx and Engels after an analysis of the revolutions and counter-revolutions in France and Germany and after a careful examination of the political positions and ideological programmes of the classes and parties the revolutions set in motion.

The revolutionary processes of that period were refracted in the consciousness of each class differently giving rise to illusions and crises among the bourgeois and the petty-bourgeois democrats and strengthening the class consciousness of the proletariat. The revolution put to a practical test every ideological system that different parties and classes had adopted. It stimulated the growth of conservative trends in the ideology of the big bourgeoisie which resulted in its world outlook taking on a regressive character. The revolution precipitated a crisis of the illusions of the petty-bourgeois democracy and the petty-bourgeois concept of socialism. The revolution helped the working class see more clearly its role in history, what it should do, and generally stimulated its class self-awareness.

The revolution of 1848-49 set in motion large sections of the petty bourgeoisie and revived petty-bourgeois ide-

ology. This of course attracted the attention of Marx and Engels who took a new interest in analyzing petty-bourgeois revolutionism and how it was refracted in the minds of the petty bourgeoisie, an interest in establishing the significance of the subjective factor, the role of ideologies and ideologists in a broad historical context.

Marx wrote: "Just as little must one imagine that the democratic representatives are indeed all shopkeepers or enthusiastic champions of shopkeepers. According to their education and their individual position they may be as far apart as heaven from earth. What makes them representatives of the petty bourgeoisie is the fact that in their minds they do not get beyond the limits which the latter do not get beyond in life, that they are consequently driven, theoretically, to the same problems and solutions to which material interest and social position drive the latter practically. This is, in general, the relationship between the *political* and *literary representatives* of a class and the class they represent."¹ Marx's full-scale characterization contains a number of methodological principles outside the framework of which it is impossible to gain an understanding of ideology as the theoretical consciousness of a class and the demands made on it that follow from this definition.

Different forms of ownership, social conditions of existence are dominated by a whole superstructure of a great variety of feelings, illusions, modes of thinking and outlooks on the world. The whole class creates and shapes all this on the basis of its material conditions. What then is the task of ideology and ideologists? What role do they have to play? When we deal with the creativity of feelings, sentiments, images, etc. by a class we are dealing with the unwitting creativity of social psychology. Ideology and ideologists have different task. They do not go beyond the social borders of their class either, their theoretical horizon is limited by the interests and objective position of their own class. However, there is a substantial difference between social psy-

chology and ideology, between how the same common class line is expressed by practical and theoretical representatives of that class.

The petty-bourgeois nature of an ideologist has a different appearance from that of a shopkeeper and they are indeed as far apart "as heaven from earth". This is what makes the exposure of the social substance of different views in literature and art so difficult in all complex forms of social consciousness in which a class-motivated point of view finds an indirect expression and differs in terms of external manifestation from the everyday behaviour of practical representatives of the class. Marx warns above all against a vulgar sociological approach, a simplistic understanding of the link between ideology and everyday practice.

Ideology rises over the structure of sentiments and beliefs, images and thoughts, illuminations and delusions which everyday life generates. Its task is to grasp and express objective interests and social status of a class in theoretical, systematized form. Ideology is a system of views. It is impossible to derive an ideological programme from a "condensation" of social sentiments and images. The development of ideology calls for a theoretical analysis of the position of the class within the system of definite social relations, for identifying its relationships with other classes and thus it calls for an analysis of the interests and the social roles of these other classes. This is the only way in which the actual class interest of a major section of society can be expressed, which is not a mechanical physical sum total of the interests of its constituent individuals and not even of groups. An integral would be closer to the truth as a symbol of the class interest of this section of the society rather than a sum total.

This overall, integrated class interest may not only fail to coincide with, but actually contradict the interests of different groups within the class, let alone those of its individual members. One of the weaknesses of the petty bourgeoisie as a class is precisely its attempt to adapt its theory to the interests of a particular faction or a group and sacrifice the goals of the class as a whole on the altar of its group interests. In other words, it keeps to a narrow group point of view and is quite in-

¹ K. Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 424.

capable of expressing the interests of the class as a whole, notably in explosive political situations.

The theoretical consciousness of a class expressed in its ideology as a system of views is a form of rationalization of its programme goals and tasks, an expression of the interests of the class as a whole, and not just as that of individual groups or factions. It can only be developed by relying on the latest scientific achievements. This is the first duty of ideology. Such an integrated consciousness was developed by the early ideologists of the French bourgeois revolution in the form of "true illusions".

During the revolution of 1848-49 the bourgeoisie no longer had an integral system of views capable of advancing a slogan for broad popular masses to join in the struggle. This was attributable not only to the fact that bourgeois ideologists and politicians had diminished in stature and popularity and that on a personal level they were unequal to the tasks of the day. Since the French revolution of 1789-93 there had occurred a substantial social shift to the right among the bourgeoisie which was now more afraid of the proletariat than of the feudal reaction. During the French revolution the bourgeoisie put forward an open ideological programme, for its interests coincided with those of the whole "third estate" and the revolutionary bourgeois ideology formulated them clearly and expressed them most fully. This was an ideological programme born of the general opposition of the third estate to the feudal regime and was capable of becoming the standard of a mass struggle, for at that juncture in history it expressed the interests of the masses who had a vital stake in the elimination of feudal-estate ways.

For its time the ideology of the French revolution was an effective ideology since the class contradictions within the third estate were still embryonic while the full implications of the slogans of liberty, equality and brotherhood had not yet been revealed sufficiently clearly by bourgeois practice. The strength of the pre-revolutionary bourgeois consciousness on the threshold of a new era which was to replace feudalism lay in the fact that it was the ideology of revolutionary practical action, an ideology oriented towards the future, capable of

generating enthusiasm, inspiration and upsurge of social consciousness and its slogans were far from being mere words. Marx wrote: "The *interest* of the bourgeoisie in the 1789 Revolution, far from having been a '*failure*', '*won*' everything and had '*most effective success*', however much its '*pathos*' has evaporated and the '*enthusiastic*' flowers with which that interest adorned its cradle have faded. That *interest* was so powerful that it was victorious over the pen of Marat, the guillotine of the Terror and the sword of Napoleon as well as the crucifix and the blue blood of the Bourbons."¹

With the establishment of the capitalist mode of production and a matching way of life, bourgeois ideas became inevitably devalued and could no longer be supported by the course of social progress, the interests of the broad popular masses; on the contrary, they were coming increasingly into open conflict with them. To quote Marx again: "...The most numerous part of the mass, the part distinct from the bourgeoisie, did not have its *real* interest in the principle of the Revolution, did not have a revolutionary principle of its *own*, but only an '*idea*', and hence only an object of momentary *enthusiasm* and only seeming *uplift*."² Such absolute values of bourgeois ideology as liberty, equality and brotherhood which were advanced by the bourgeoisie on the eve of the revolution had been eroded by time and failed to hold their own at the trial of history. Bourgeois ideology entered upon a period of deep chronic crisis during which once much-coveted values became devalued.

The Marxist methodology presupposes an analysis not only of the general content of ideology but of the entire diversity of ideological manifestations including the individuality of the ideologists, more specifically the level of their scientific and theoretical training and moral and political qualities. The latter circumstance should be emphasized since among today's "critics" of Marxism the old accusations to the effect that Marxism is allegedly concerned with global problems only are back

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Holy Family". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 81.

² *Ibid.*, p. 82.

in fashion. They assert that Marxism can see the forest but fails to notice that the forest is made of living trees, that Marxism studies the general movement of history—society, classes, mass movements and mass ideologies—but it knows little or nothing about personality and individual consciousness. Marxism, they claim, sees only the highway of history but is unable to see the trail along which a lone traveler is making his way, lost in the labyrinth of society. From these artificially constructed contrasts they conclude that the Marxist sociological analysis has no room for the personal initiative of the individual, no room for conscience, reason and choice. In short, Marxism is allegedly suffering from “existential deficiency” and thus is unable to reflect life in its diversity and wealth of manifestations.

A pet tactic employed by the revisionist theorists is to lay claim to the “authentic reading” of Marx. Their pretentiousness like any other sign of ill breeding and lack of manners, is so obsessive that one gets the impression that the revisionist interpreters of Marxism are the only people who have learned how to read Marx as Marx had wanted to be read and understood. They profess to be concerned most of all by “what Marx really said”. However, the “authentic reading” of Marx and the finding out of what he really said indicate a lack of scientific objective among his opponents. Suffice it to refer the reader to Marx’s *The Poverty of Philosophy* and *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* for him to see the groundlessness of such accusations.

Marx, in giving an overall characterization of the petty-bourgeois ideology, devoted particular attention to the views of Proudhon, one of its most typical spokesmen whose erroneous views did considerable damage to the workers’ movement. This analysis is of interest in that it discloses general Marxist sociological principles in the study of personality, its intellectual and moral characteristics.

Marx examined Proudhon’s theoretical views through the prism of the objectively contradictory social status of the class whose spiritual mouthpiece he was. Proudhon’s habit of doing everything by halves, the constant vacillation of the petty bourgeoisie between labour

and capital, its attempts to rise above the social antagonisms were matched by the eclectic muddle-headedness of its ideologists, who did not share a common world outlook, who forever tried to reconcile the irreconcilable, to combine the uncombinable, to make incompatible things be compatible, to be on both sides of the fence at once. Marx’s verdict on Proudhon, the ideologist, was demolishing: “He wants to be the synthesis—he is a composite error.”¹

The “composite error” instead of the “synthesis” was the inevitable result of Proudhon’s endless dodges and vacillations, of his interminable attempts to smooth everything over, to reconcile everything and reach agreement on everything. It was the logical result of his concessions and compromises on matters of principle, so characteristic of all forms of the petty-bourgeois capitulationism and of the political unscrupulousness, ideological and moral double-dealing springing from it.

Proudhon’s theoretical eclecticism, the consequence of his social practice, does not absolve him from the personal responsibility he, as the ideological representative of the working class shouldered, since it was his direct duty to express in theoretical terms the actual situation and actual interests of his class. However Proudhon failed to rise to the occasion. Marx wrote: “M. Proudhon flatters himself on having given a criticism of both political economy and communism: he is beneath them both. Beneath the economists, since, as a philosopher who has at his elbow a magic formula, he thought he could dispense with going into purely economic details; beneath the socialists, because he has neither courage enough nor insight enough to rise, be it even speculatively, above the bourgeois horizon...”

He wants to soar as the man of science above the bourgeois and the proletarians; he is merely the petty bourgeois, continually tossed back and forth between capital and labour, political economy and communism.”²

Proudhon’s personal weaknesses contributed to his theoretical downfall. The close attention Marx and Eng-

¹ K. Marx, “The Poverty of Philosophy”. In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 178.

² *Ibid.*

els paid to Proudhon's early works which they welcomed and the support they gave to the self-educated worker theorist he was are well known. At the same time Marx and Engels advised Proudhon to delve deeper into theory and make his explorations more scientific. Proudhon, however, did not follow this advice with the result that his theoretical failings, "rawness" coupled with his inordinate ambition (something that always goes hand in hand with semi-knowledge and semi-culture) had a most disastrous effect on his entire work. The philosophy of poverty which Proudhon expounded turned out to be a poverty of philosophy.

As for Proudhon's later epigones who had degenerated into ordinary bourgeois reformists they exhibited no integrity of views, conviction and moral principles whatsoever. Those were the sort of people who, to use a phrase coined by the great Russian satirist Saltykov-Shchedrin: "started out acting in the light of circumstances and ended up acting in the light of meanness", whose "thoughts... are most reasonable sentiments—giving offense to no one and who have but a modicum of conscience left".¹ Capitalists have always recruited political renegades and turncoats among the "motley" crowd of such obliging characters.

The consistent determinism of Marxist ideology does not at all imply any belittling of the historical initiative and moral responsibility of men, their conscience, and moral integrity. This is a Marxist axiom. Lenin taught "to observe *every* other social class in *all* the manifestations of its intellectual, ethical, and political life..."² He wrote with sarcasm that "...only people devoid of all principle are capable of changing, in twenty-four hours, or, for that matter, in twenty-four months, their view."³ This is the true attitude of Marxism-Leninism to the problem of personal responsibility which today's revisionists and other critics of Marxism are at pains to distort.

¹ M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, *The Fairy-Tales*, Moscow, 1973, p. 89 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?" *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 412.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Where to Begin", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 18.

The Marxist analysis shows that in the study of ideologies the investigator must not detach himself from the personality aspect interpreted in the socio-materialistic sense of the term—what requirements and tasks of the moment face the ideological representatives of a class and to what extent they are ready and prepared in a theoretical and moral sense to cope with them.

Different properties and qualities of phenomena reveal themselves in different relationships and situations and thus display their inherent substantive parameters. The rich diversity of aspects and functions of ideology as a complex social phenomenon reveals itself in its projections when it impinges on other component elements of the social structure—economics, politics, science, morals, literature and art. Therefore it is wrong to elevate an individual function of ideology into an absolute category and oppose it to all the others. Some tend to believe that the main function of ideology is to express and maintain the interests of a particular class. This definition of ideology's main function, while correct in principle, is still inadequate in that it fails to reveal ideology's special features in relation to a number of other phenomena. Despite the fundamental importance for ideology of expressing and maintaining class interests, this definition fails to reveal certain specific features of ideological activity as distinct from political activity in which the defense of class interests is a straightforward and direct task, even though it does reveal with sufficient clarity the distinction between ideology and science, between social and natural scientific knowledge.

The specific task of ideology and ideologists is not merely to defend the class interests but to ensure the theoretical awareness of the position and interests of a class as a whole, to implement these theoretically recognized interests in politics and other areas of social activities, to develop a programme of action on the basis of which the class concerned could organize its political struggle. It is a specific task of ideology to help the class concerned to define accurately its attitude to other classes and parties. These fundamental policy tasks and aims found their fullest and complete expression in the scientific ideology of the working class.

The formation of a new type of ideology—scientific

ideology—was associated not only with a new approach to theoretical problems as such and looking for an answer "...to questions already raised by foremost minds of mankind"¹, but at the same time with its clear-cut world view and the exact definition of the proletarian, class content and party character and thrust. In effect, these questions were interconnected and expressed two aspects of the formation of a socialist ideology: its scientific objectivity and class origin.

The very emergence of socialist ideology was a derivative of the effort to establish the proletariat's mission in world history. The fundamental distinguishing feature of the working class lies in the fact that its social behaviour is not subject to regulation by utopia, or myth or tradition alone. Its objective position within capitalist relations, the character and aims of its class struggle give rise to an objective need for a scientific ideology of a new type. Marx and Engels disclosed the role of the working class in world history as the builder of new society, they substantiated scientifically communist ideals and linked them with the class struggle of the proletariat. Thus social utopias and illusions were replaced by the firm foundations of science which gave the working class that great slogan of struggle: revolutionary overthrow of the exploiting society and the building of a new, better world.

Marx, Engels and Lenin pointed out that socialist ideology expressed the general, international conditions of the struggle and emancipation of the working class while the Communists as a party represented the interests of the movement as a whole and, through all intermediate phases of the struggle, never lose sight of its ultimate goals and programme tasks. Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto*: "The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march,

the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement."¹ They went on: "The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present they also represent and take care of the future of that movement."² As for their ideas "they merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes".³

The strategic task of ideology, then, is to equip the working class with a theoretical awareness of its historic goals and tasks which transcend the framework of everyday spontaneous notions and ideas as these take shape in the mass consciousness of the class under the impact and influence of its everyday practice.

Ideology also has a social function which is peculiar to it alone. We might regard ideology as a concentrated expression of the policy of a class in the sphere of intellectual and spiritual life.

As material production changes it brings about changes affecting spiritual production. At the same time intellectual and spiritual life being shaped by socio-economic and political conditions develops under the direct influence of the ideology which is dominant in society, of the full range of ideological factors. By virtue of its complexity and delicate nature the ideological factors of spiritual life affecting its development cannot be replaced by any other regulators, measures and means which would be at all effective.

Each class attaches tremendous importance to the implementation of its own ideological line in the sphere of spiritual production, in every area of spiritual life. It attaches great importance to the influence it exerts on social consciousness and public opinion and to this end it develops its own ideological strategy, forms, methods and techniques of exerting its ideological influence on the rest of society.

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 497.

² *Ibid.*, p. 518.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 498.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 23.

The ideological influence of a class, its ability to advance inspiring, organizing and mobilizing ideas is a true index of its historical viability, political power and ability to manage society. Therefore it is only logical that, as Lenin emphasized: "When the bourgeoisie's ideological influence on the workers declines, is undermined or weakened, the bourgeoisie *everywhere and always* resorts to the most outrageous lies and slander."¹ Lies and slander, refusal to enter an open ideological polemics, to compare directly ideological principles is a sure sign of a declining influence of bourgeois ideology, of its internal decay.

Ideology expresses class interest and the point is what does that imply? The Marxist view of interest is that it is not anything subjectivist or arbitrary but, on the contrary, has an objectivized content stemming from the socio-economic position of a class. Engels emphasized: "The economic relations of a given society present themselves in the first place as *interests*."² It is the specific feature of the ideological investigation of reality that it addresses itself to the economic relations of classes through an analysis of their interests, i.e., ideology, studies these relations not as an end in itself but through the prism of their refraction in social interests. The ideological aspect is present in any social cognition of reality and any ideology seeks to use the findings of social sciences. In ideology, however, another task is pushed to the foreground, a strategic task—to formulate the programme goals of a class, to integrate group interests, and these can vary widely even within the proletariat, into a single interest which expresses, firstly, the programme goals of the struggle of that class and secondly, its general overall interest, and not an interest of a narrow group.

On the basis of programme goals and general class interests as expressed in ideology the class in question consolidates its ranks and develops its political self-awareness. This helps the class to see what sets it apart from other classes, and its own role and mission. In

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Bourgeois Intelligentsia's Methods of Struggle Against the Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 485.

² F. Engels, "The Housing Question". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, p. 363.

other words, ideology is called upon to present an integrated picture of the position of different classes in society. Not surprisingly did Lenin emphasize that the socialist consciousness of the working class embraces not only the sphere of its relations with the bourgeoisie but also its relations with all the other classes, with the state.¹

The revolutionary consciousness of Russia's proletariat took shape relatively rapidly because the Bolshevik Party had successfully solved the task set by Lenin to respond to each and every instance of arbitrary rule, oppression, violence and abuses whatever class happened to be at the receiving end of them.

The effectiveness of ideology, the degree of its influence on social progress, the development of science and culture depend on the internal correlation of its cognitive and social functions. To serve as a social sign-post, ideology cannot do without analyzing reality since it contains a cognitive investigatory element. The problem of correlation between social and gnoseological aspects in ideologies is a concrete historical problem which cannot be solved in the abstract.

Marx demonstrated that the bourgeois and especially petty-bourgeois ideology during the 1848-49 revolution was eclectic in terms of internal structure. It could not analyze reality soberly, could not rise above the group, factional rivalries and strife within the dominant class and failed to formulate its overall interests which demanded a defense of democracy. Step by step, by abandoning its own bourgeois-democratic and political principles it cleared the way for the Bonaparte dictatorship. The class interests were sacrificed on the altar of factional interests of a narrow group. By contrast the ideology of the French bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1789-93 was on the whole an adequate spiritual expression of the epoch and shared with it all its victories and defeats, truths and errors. For its time it was an advanced ideology capable of serving as a guide to action in a broad historical context and for scientific exploration of the world.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 400-01.

In another historical situation, in another country, the Russia of the 1860s, representatives of Russian revolutionary democracy were able to express the interests of the peasant masses and the requirements of social progress and developed a comprehensive, integrated revolutionary-democratic ideology which was quite advanced for the Russia of those days. In both cases the social functions of ideology did not contradict the tasks of cognition and in fact stimulated their solution and for this reason these ideological currents represented a step forward in mankind's spiritual and cultural advance.

The loss by an ideology of its cognitive functions implies an internal crisis of the given type of social consciousness and may be attributed to a change in the socio-historical role of the class concerned whose positions have come into conflict with the mainstream of social progress. Thus, early bourgeois ideology proceeded from the advanced philosophical doctrines of its day which were noted for a strict rationalism and faith in the great potentialities of human reason. Hegel wrote: "The words inscribed on Isis veil: 'I am what was, what is and will be: no mortal ever lifted my veil', melt away before the power of thought."¹

Present-day bourgeois ideology which has gone over to the positions of extreme irrationalism, which has deliberately refused to analyze scientifically social reality and has thus lost for all practical purposes its cognitive functions, presents a fundamentally different picture. To be sure, its loss of cognitive functions should not be described in a simplistic way. It is a fact that the measures carried out by monopoly capital (for all their limited and local nature), to adapt the results of the current scientific and technological revolution to the needs of monopolies, have been developed within the framework of bourgeois sociology and management science which are in the mainstream of bourgeois ideology and which represent for the most part its liberal trends. These developments are in harmony with Lenin's conclusion that bourgeois scientists

working in special fields can make certain valuable contributions but cannot be trusted one iota when it comes to philosophy, i.e., fundamental generalizations about the life of society as a whole.¹ Lenin formulated the position of Marxist scientists on this issue—to be able to apply the results of such special investigations for practical problem-solving and at the same time "to be able to lop off their reactionary tendency, to pursue your own line and to combat the whole line of the forces and classes hostile to us."²

From its inception socialist ideology in which the quest for truth and the defense of the class interest of the proletariat blended fully has been of a consistently scientific character.

The category of truth and class interest in Marxist-Leninist ideology far from being opposed to each other are mutually complementary. The social positions of the working class secure the progress of scientific knowledge. And the greater the successes of science, the more does it come into harmony with the vital interests of the proletariat. There is nothing selfish in the proletariat's class-oriented approach to things, this approach is free of any narrow-mindedness either social, racial or national. This is attributable not only to the personal unimpeachable intellectual integrity of its outstanding ideologists but also to the objective position of the working class which they represented so well.

Thus a major task of ideology is to rationalize in theoretical terms the objective position of a class in society and to identify its vital interests and historical tasks and finally to formulate its "battle cry". This makes it incumbent on the ideological representatives of the class to engage in serious scientific work, to assert class-oriented views on all social processes for there is no such thing as a disinterested, unbiased social science, or an unbiased view on phenomena which affect the real and practical interests of classes.

The socialist ideology provides every opportunity for tackling this task in a creative spirit because as a sci-

¹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Werke*, Bd. 9, Frankfurt am. Main, 1970, S. 19.

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 342.

² *Ibid.*, p. 343.

entific ideology it has achieved for the first time in the history of social thought an organic unity between social and gnoseological functions.

3. Ideology as a Factor of Social Action

Ideology is not only a specific form of reflecting and exploring social reality, not only a class-determined theoretical system of concepts, ideas, images and ideals but it is also a definite system of functioning of ideas, a system actively involved in social practice.

The primacy of material and secondary nature of ideological relations does not imply either a negation or any belittling of the role of ideology as an active social factor in human affairs. In exposing the substance of the idealist interpretation of ideology which sees in it a demiurge, the maker of history, Marx and Engels emphasized that this approach puts "the thing upside-down".¹

This approach to the problem was attributable firstly to the solution of the main gnoseological question—that of the primacy of the material and secondary importance of the ideological; and secondly, to the establishment of the dependence of ideological forms on the conditions of social being. Failure to solve the first task, that relating to the nature of ideology, made it impossible to solve the second, that of its role. This was the only truly historical and logical procedure for tackling the problem.

To be able to identify scientifically the origin of a particular idea, to establish just how faithfully social being is mirrored in social consciousness is to be able to assess their viability, social effectiveness and their potential for influencing actively the course of history. Lenin put it succinctly when speaking of the main source of the power of the ideas of scientific communism, he said: "The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true."²

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 420.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 23.

There is one other aspect to the problem. Materialism in the theory of ideology is directly associated with realism in ideological activity. Only from positions of the materialist view of all social processes can one investigate the ideological aspects of the economic and social life of a society and mobilize the tremendous opportunities that total commitment, excellent organization of the men involved secure for tackling practical tasks.

Engels emphasized: "Political, legal, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic, etc., development is based on economic development. But all these react upon one another and also upon the economic basis."¹ In this process of mutual influence and aggregate feedback effect on social processes ideology displays its relative independence and activity.

Ideology is a reflection of social being. Naturally the degree of completeness and depth of this reflection depends on the degree of maturity of the social relations being reflected. Thus, the concept of developed socialism could only take shape in Marxist-Leninist science when socialist social forms attained full maturity in fact. At the same time the solution of the new problem calls for appropriate scientific premises which equip the investigator with suitable methodological tools and supply him with requisite ideological and or theoretical material. The elaboration of the concept of developed socialism relied not only on contemporary social practice but it had been prepared by the entire preceding evolution of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the communist formation with its two phases, of socialist revolution and socialist construction.

All this made it possible to characterize in some detail the basic features of a developed socialist society and define its place in history with scientific exactitude in the context of the emergence of the new formation as an indispensable component, as a relatively long stretch of the road from capitalism to communism.

This, in rough outline, is the overall progress of social thought which presupposes the existence of an in-

¹ "Engels to W. Borgius in Breslau, London, January 25, 1894". In: Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, pp. 441-42.

herent logic in the development of ideas, consistency in posing and tackling theoretical and ideological problems.

The specific feature of the ideological reflection of reality lies in the fact that the economic basis of society is refracted *differently* in different "prisms" of social consciousness, and the refraction is subject to the internal laws governing the development of specific forms of spiritual production, those operating in literature and art being different from those in law and morality. The process of inheriting and drawing on the already accumulated stock of spiritual values takes specific forms peculiar to the area of intellectual life in question. This process takes a different form in, say, philosophy as compared with art.

The legal standards, moral principles, economic concepts and philosophical categories are by no means mirror-like, smooth reflections of reality, no mechanical replica of real phenomena but rather the result of a sophisticated intellectual effort involving a fair degree of detachment and abstraction. For their part artistic images are no illustration of socio-economic categories or philosophical theses. Artistic and scientific thinking reflects objective reality using forms and methods peculiar to it. The better these specific forms and methods are used, the more accurate and comprehensive is the resultant reflection.

The problem of the activity of ideology is inseparable from the nature of interpretation of the historical process, and of the role of the subjective factor in social development. The critics of Marxism have still not been able to resolve the dilemma of the objective and subjective in history.

On the one hand, Western sociologists seek to portray Marxist ideology as an intuitivist concept on the grounds that it rejects an accurate preliminary computation of the social events involved. However, an ideology is not supposed to provide any quantified calculations, or to give a timetable for the occurrence of particular events, including revolutions, since revolutions are not made to order.

The task of an ideological vision of history is different: to identify accurately enough the basic trends in

social development, to reveal their complex and contradictory intertwining in the kaleidoscope of events, facts, phenomena, to show what social forces are behind these trends, and on this basis to make a forecast of how the objective logic of historical development will shape the future and estimate the probability of this or that turn of events actually occurring. It is easy to see that what the critics of Marxism mean by intuitivism is Marxism's dialectical-materialistic view of the multi-dimensional nature of the historical process which is not subject to mechanistic determinism.

On the other hand, bourgeois ideologists are trying to equate historical materialism with a naturalist treatment of social development and present it as a form of mechanistic determinism.

In actual fact, however, the reverse is true. Marx and Engels emphasized that they were "... setting out from real active men...".¹ Spelling out their views they repeatedly opposed the view of history whereby it is an anonymous, fatalistic process in which there is allegedly no room for the historical initiative of classes, parties, for social action by real people. Engels wrote: "*History does nothing*, it '*possesses no immense wealth*', it '*wages no battles*'. It is *man*, real, living man who does all that, who possesses and fights; '*history*' is not, as it were, a person apart, using man as a means to achieve *its own* aims; history is *nothing but* the activity of man pursuing his aims."² Leninism, as the creative, living Marxism of our time, has fully embraced this active aspect of the historical process which cannot realize itself outside the activity of men, without the subjective factor it represents.

It should be noted that recent years have seen stepped-up attacks on the Marxist proposition on the active character of the human personality, with most of the attacks coming from the Leftists who fear that undue preoccupation with the problem of personalities may result in the role of the masses being partly forgotten. In fact, however, this danger is more apparent

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 36.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Holy Family". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 93.

than real for it has been generated by the very specific ideology and practice of "barracks socialism" where the interests of the human personality are sacrificed on the altar of aims and tasks which are alien to the true socialist view of the world and way of life. The very polarization of "abstract personality" and "featureless anonymous mass" is a typical characteristic of the petty-bourgeois mentality irrespective of whether it accords primacy to the "personality" or "the mass".

Within the active aspect of the historical process, in the social activity of human beings who set themselves concrete aims and tasks, in the formation of new social forces and their consolidation, the creative role belongs to ideas, ideas which have won the minds of men to become an integral element of any historical movement.

The significance and relevance of any ideology is determined by the impact it makes on social development. New ideas *per se* may take one beyond the confines of old ideas. But the substance of things is changed only when "theory... becomes a material force as soon as it has gripped the masses".¹ The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of blending scientific socialism with the workers' movement can be traced back to this formula.

In contrast to all preceding ideological trends and philosophical systems Marxism put forward a fundamentally new task—to convert ideology into a material force. Marx detailed this task in two basic aspects: 1) theory must become the property of the masses and 2) mass revolutionary consciousness is impossible without a mass revolutionary movement.

The new thing about Marx's approach to the problem was that before him even the greatest minds, while fully aware of the social significance of progressive ideas, reduced the essence of the problem to the putting forward of the particular "ideas of the century" in the belief that these ideas would reform the world by themselves. Thus, the socialist utopians when they spoke of the need to propagate their ideas widely

sincerely believed they would eventually convert the educated, enlightened people from among "the powers that be" to their faith. Marx's approach was fundamentally different. As Marx saw it, theory should grip the masses as an essential condition of the effectiveness of the new ideology, and mass consciousness had to be changed as an indispensable aspect of revolutionary practical action.

Revolution in one form or another was necessary not only because there was no other method of toppling the ruling class but also because the oppressed class would be able to change its own mentality through revolutionary struggle.

These propositions are remarkable in that they show the tremendous importance Marxism attaches to advanced ideas, scientific theory and revolutionary ideology, as a means of changing the existing state of affairs. They have convincingly proved that Marxism has nothing to do with "economic materialism" nor with mechanistic determinism which negates an active, transforming role of consciousness. The more accurately an ideology reflects reality and the real interests of the advanced class, the deeper and more completely does it grip the practical mass consciousness, the greater is its impact on the course of history.

In tackling the problem of the activity of ideology Marxism took a new approach to the method of introducing the masses to the advanced type of consciousness, a new approach to political education and self-education. The Enlighteners' view which was dominant before the advent of Marxism reduced the issue to the spread of knowledge leaving aside the question of objective prerequisites for the assimilation of that knowledge. Marx attached great importance to scientific knowledge, to the political education of the masses, above all of the working class. In his letter to M. Lachâtre (the publisher of the first volume of *Capital* in French) he wrote: "I fully accept your idea of publishing the French translation of my *Capital* in periodic instalments. In this form the work will become more accessible to the working class and this, to me, is of decisive importance."¹

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 33, S. 434.

¹ K. Marx, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law. Introduction". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 182.

At the same time Marxist political education has nothing to do with abstract sermonizing and empty moralizing in the name of education. Marx and Engels caustically ridiculed all moralists when they wrote: "The philosopher does not say directly: You are not people. He says: You have always been people, but you were not *conscious* of what you were, and for that very reason you were not in reality True People He imagines that his moral demands to people—the demand that they should change their consciousness—will bring about this altered consciousness" ¹

This represented a qualitatively new approach to the problem of consciousness and education which overcame the contemplative view of the whole of preceding materialism. This conclusion was the immediate result of the materialistic interpretation of the social process as applied to problems of education. As true revolutionary Communists, Marx and Engels posited that the revolutionary education of the masses could not be conducted by means of education alone. To develop a mass revolutionary consciousness a mass revolutionary movement was required. Marx and Engels tackled the problem of education proceeding from this basic assumption. Already in *The Holy Family* Marx outlined this idea when he wrote: "If man is shaped by environment, his environment must be made human." ²

The "circumstances—man" formula bears only a superficial resemblance to the "environment—man" formula adopted by French materialism. These two formulas have a different substance. French sensualism regarded man as the passive product of his environment. Although this was a progressive idea for its time, on the whole it was limited on account of its speculative and unhistorical nature. Marx and Engels who pioneered a materialistic interpretation of the social environment took the view that "circumstances make men just as much as men make circumstances . . ." ³

¹ K. Marx, F. Engels, "The German Ideology". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 250.

² K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Holy Family". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 131.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

These ideas emphasize the active nature of human activity and indicate fundamentally new approaches to the formation of consciousness and education discovered by Marxism. Pre-Marxian materialism with its naturalistic interpretation of society and man, failed to resolve the contradiction: "environment—man". If man is the product of his environment then who and what creates this environment? Therefore the pre-Marxian materialist divided the world into the "educators" and the "educated" quite forgetting that the "educator" must himself be educated.

The problem of moulding the man of the future proved a perennial stumbling block for the socialist utopians. Great minds, they were fully aware that the communist society of the future would require a new man. They rightly believed that the man of the future would be a harmoniously developed man with a new attitude to work and to his fellow-men, dedicated to improving the common weal, a man with lofty spiritual needs, a man free from the lies, heartlessness and prejudices of the old world. But in their blueprints for the future the utopians came up against a contradiction they could not resolve.

On the one hand, men are what their lives make them. Life in a society dominated by private property generates matching instincts and attitudes, a bourgeois mentality and morals, and dictates laws of the jungle in human relations. On the other hand, people living in such a society will have to build a new society, one free from oppression and exploitation, and those same people will have to live and work in the new society and be guided by the lofty standards of morality and justice.

Utopian socialism saw no way of resolving this contradiction. The utopians looked to enlightened reformers to develop perfect forms of human life which they would then present to their fellow-men on a silver platter. Hence their attempts to first improve human nature, reform men's morals before starting to build the new life.

It was only Marxism that resolved this very real contradiction effectively. In his *Theses on Feuerbach* Marx pointed out that the problem of changing circumstances and consciousness could be rationally grasped and understood through the revolutionary practical activity of

THE LENINIST CONCEPT OF SCIENTIFIC IDEOLOGY. PROBLEMS OF METHOD AND CONTENT

man who by changing the external world would change his own nature.¹ This was a major fundamental proposition advanced by Marx. It underlies the Marxist-Leninist concept of transforming consciousness and of communist education.

In this way the single and interconnected problem of ideology and mass revolutionary practical action, the problem of theory and practice, finds its solution. Ideology, then, cannot be reduced to theoretical knowledge. Its task is to make its own content accessible to the masses, the property of mass consciousness, to wed scientific action to practical action. In other words, ideology is an organizing factor, an instrument of class cohesion on the basis of particular ideas and a world outlook.

The task of socialist ideology is to substantiate, in theoretical terms, the need for revolutionary action, to spur the masses into taking this action, to implant in the proletariat and the rest of the popular masses a firm faith in their powers, to organize and unite them.

The scientific socialist ideology of the working class brings together its three main functions—theoretical-cognitive, class-orientating, and social-organizing. Together they shape scientific ideology as an integral organic unity of views and social actions stemming from them.

No Marxist before Lenin had studied ideological problems on a scale or as carefully and in such a broad social context, as he did. Lenin examined ideological problems in their many different interactions with economics, politics, international relations, science, culture, literature and art and the social psychology of different classes and groups.

That this titanic encyclopaedic effort based on an incredible wealth of social facts and phenomena should have been carried out by a single man was explained not only by Lenin's genius as thinker, scholar and ideologist but also by the practical political tasks which the working class faced in the new historical era, one marked by the revolutionary transition of mankind from capitalism to communism. At no other period of human history has there been a greater need for a comprehensive ideological and theoretical analysis of human affairs.

Lenin's historic contribution is that he has studied in depth the emergence and development of Marxism as the scientific ideology of the working class, that he has defended the Marxist doctrine of socialist ideology from revisionist distortion and equipped the Communist Party and the working class with a comprehensive ideological programme of a socialist revolution.

Lenin showed the revolutionary-critical substance of socialist ideology, analyzed its role at different stages of the working class's revolutionary struggle (from the introduction of socialist consciousness into the spontane-

¹ See K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 7.

ous workers' movement to the moulding of a scientific world outlook in every member of society under developed socialism).

By generalizing in philosophical terms the latest achievements of natural science and the new phenomena of social and economic life at the juncture of two eras of human history, Lenin introduced the concept of scientific ideology into Marxist sociology. He substantiated the role of socialist ideology as a force for class consolidation which precedes the creation of other forms of consolidation. Lenin wrote: "Justice is an empty word, say ... those rascals who are inclined to proclaim themselves Marxists on the lofty grounds that they have 'contemplated the *hind parts*' of economic materialism.

"Ideas become a power when they grip the masses. And precisely at the present time the Bolsheviks, i.e., the representatives of revolutionary proletarian internationalism, have embodied in their policy the idea that is motivating countless working people all over the world."¹

Lenin disclosed the importance of the party of a new type and of its practical revolutionary activity for translating ideas into reality having shown the historic necessity for coalescing socialist ideology with a mass workers' movement. He wrote: "... Only with the aid of an excellent organisation can we turn our moral strength into material strength."²

Lenin substantiated the role and place of ideology and of the ideological activity of the Marxist-Leninist party upon winning power when the positive task of developing a sensitive fine network of new social relations gets top priority, when the emphasis is solidly on economic development, the defence of the socialist homeland, on the communist education of the rising generation, of all working people, on overcoming the survivals of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois past in human consciousness and behaviour, and on shaping a new way of life.

Lenin disclosed the laws of class struggle in the sphere

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 129-30.

² V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to A. A. Bogdanov and S. I. Gusev", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 145.

of ideology. He demonstrated that the confrontation between socialist and bourgeois ideologies dominated the basic spiritual content of the contemporary era, being a reflection of the struggle between the two main classes of today's society—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—a struggle whose battlefield is the entire world. In this struggle the ideological and moral potential of society is every bit as important as its economic, scientific and technological potential. This cardinal thought Lenin formulated immediately after the victory of the October Revolution. When the country and the Party were taking the first steps in socialist construction Lenin pointed out that although in the economic and military respects Soviet Russia was weak, in the moral respect it was stronger than any other country. Lenin wrote: "This has been proved in practice; it has been proved not merely by words but by deeds; it has been proved once and, if history takes a certain turn, it will, perhaps, be proved many times again."¹ Just as Lenin foresaw, history, indeed, proved this on repeated occasions.

Lenin treated the ideological activity of the Communist Party as an indispensable integral part of its leadership in social development. He warned that any let-up in the Party's ideological activity, any belittling of the Party's leading role in the spiritual life of socialist society would result in a weakening of the working class's positions in the economic and political fields and would, indeed, jeopardize the socialist gains of the people. Lenin substantiated the principles of ideological leadership which have since become known as the Leninist principles. The Leninist methods of guiding the spiritual life of socialist society which are being implemented by the Soviet Communist Party constitute leadership "by virtue of authority, energy, greater experience, greater versatility, and greater talent".²

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, December 23-28, 1921", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 151.

² V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to a Comrade on Our Organisational Tasks", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 242.

1. The Revolutionary-Critical Essence of Socialist Ideology

Characterizing socialist ideology Lenin emphasized that "Marx ... considered the whole value of his theory to lie in the fact that it is 'in its essence critical and revolutionary'".¹ This latter quality is peculiar to Marxism "completely and unconditionally".²

The revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology is an expression of its scientific content for only a theory that is critical and self-critical is capable of self-development. Without this there can be no scientific knowledge. The essence of socialist ideology expresses the social position of the working class, the fundamental difference of its revolution from bourgeois revolutions. Only a revolution which does not shrink from the formidable dimensions and newness of the problems it generates, only a society which has an inexhaustible potential is capable of self-criticism, and such a society will inherit the future world. Such a revolution is a proletarian revolution and the society is socialist society. The Great October Socialist Revolution was the first revolution in human history whose results matched its original aims.

The revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology as its most complete and unconditional quality finds expression in specific forms before and after the working class wins political power. In broad terms the distinction lies in the fact that before victory the main tasks of the socialist revolution is to overthrow all forms of social and national oppression, while after its victory, it is to establish new social forms, to criticize and overcome everything that impedes socialism's advance and inhibits the realization of its potential to the full.

The question of the revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology has always been a stumbling block for all right-wing revisionists and left-wing doctrinaire-sectarian elements. To this day it is the scene of fierce

struggle between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism of every hue and shade.

A typical assertion made by right-wing revisionists is that upon the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the establishment of new social relations socialist ideology allegedly loses its revolutionary-critical content to become an "institutionalized doctrine", and like any ideology, it is condemned to eventual degeneration. Right-wing revisionists impute the degeneration of a creative doctrine into an "institutionalized" one to the Party, notably to its apparatus.

These assertions are not only mistaken but they are even not original. They echo the old invention put about by the Russian opponents of Leninism among the opportunist Mensheviks who asserted that no ideas could count on practical realization in "pure form" since any political organization deforms the ideas it originally adopts. Such assertions are spearheaded above all against Lenin's doctrine on the Communist Party as a vehicle of scientific ideology and the guiding force in the revolutionary struggle and the construction of the new society. They also reflect the overall strategic thrust of imperialist policy aimed at the "de-Leninization" of the world communist movement by playing Lenin off against Marx. This explains the attempts to infiltrate into this movement a thesis to the effect that a Communist Party should not be guided by any single integral ideology for if it does, it narrows down its sphere of influence. The idea of a "non-ideological" Communist party is alien to Marxism-Leninism. Lenin emphasized: "The party of the proletariat, however, is a free association, instituted to *combat* the 'thoughts' (read: the ideology) of the bourgeoisie, to defend and put into effect one definite world outlook, namely, Marxism."¹

The question of the revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology is an integral part of a larger problem which is indissolubly linked with the scientific interpretation of the development of a socialist society, of the specific features of its contradictions and methods of resolving them. The assertions of revisionists and bourgeois

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 327.

² *Ibid.*

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Vperyod Faction", *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 270.

ideologists that theoretical thought in socialist countries allegedly regards socialist society from the standpoint of a functional analysis only and that it allegedly denies the presence of contradictions and conflicts within it are quite groundless.

The fact is that Marxist-Leninist science, while denying the existence of social antagonisms under socialism, is far from regarding socialism, including a socialist society at an advanced stage when it is sustained by its internal dynamism, as a static society free from any problems and contradictions, including contradictions between productive forces and relations of production, between the basis and the superstructure, between the interests of individuals, and those of groups and the community as a whole.

Social antagonisms and contradictions are not identical. The former constitute one of the transitional historical forms of contradictions characteristic of a society split into polarized classes. Therefore when socialism wins antagonisms disappear while contradictions of social development remain. This theoretical proposition of Lenin's has been borne out by the evolution of existing socialism.

The revisionists, as the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 showed once again, distort the essence of criticism in a socialist society and interpret the revolutionary-critical content of socialist ideology as a negation of "all and everything". But a negative slogan, unless it is backed up by a positive answer to problems, is an empty phrase, a petty-bourgeois reaction to the problems and tasks arising before a socialist society and demanding a positive practical solution, an energetic, business-like approach to problem-solving.

Lenin pointed out that the great achievements of the Russian Communists were due to the fact that they had never made concessions to the "critics" of Marxism but defended uncompromisingly the overall spirit and meaning of revolutionary theory and practice, and fought without compromise against both revisionism and the narrow-mindedness of those who slavishly followed revolutionary theory to the letter and irresponsibly juggled with phrases learnt by rote.¹ The doctrinaire sees ideology as a death-

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "Letters on Tactics", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 44-45; "'Left-Wing' Childishness and the Petty-Bourgeois Mentality", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 352-53.

mask of life, as a collection of formulae, definitions and ready-made answers and not Marxist criteria for those answers which can be obtained only through a careful study of a specific situation.

Lenin emphasized that it was absolutely essential to assimilate the indisputable truth that a Marxist should take into account the hard facts of life, that Communist is expected to pay more attention to the tasks of tomorrow rather than the tasks of yesterday. Therefore, Lenin continued, "What we need is more factual knowledge and fewer debates on ostensible communist principles."¹ Lenin never tired of stressing that "revolutionaries should be able to *think*, . . . to *analyse*".²

The revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology is a reflection of its ideological principled and creative nature. The only correct policy is one based on high principles. Lenin maintained this cardinal idea undeviatingly both in the sphere of theory and in his practical activities. Only total loyalty to high principles in theoretical and practical matters can assure a really creative attitude to both theory and practice. A creative approach is really such provided it springs from clearly defined fundamental principles.

Lenin wrote: "A disdainful attitude towards theory, evasiveness, and shilly-shallying with regard to socialist ideology inevitably play into the hands of bourgeois ideology."³ Principles are principles precisely because they are not compromised. Any approach to principles based in transitory tactical advantages and considerations of the moment is wrong. Any attempt to achieve tactical success at the price of concessions on matters of principle inevitably results in a strategic defeat. Therefore, he who neglects matters of principle in the hope of gaining an immediate tactical advantage suffers a strategic defeat which is final and irreversible. Such has been the historical lot of right-wing revisionism and left-wing adventur-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Integrated Economic Plan", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 144.

² V. I. Lenin, "Against Boycott", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 40.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Why the Social-Democrats Must Declare a Determined and Relentless War on the Socialist Revolutionaries", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 173-74.

ism which share a common pursuit of "immediate success", at the price of brushing aside considerations of principle.

For its part, loyalty to principles calls for a constant effort to develop and amplify them. This ensures the indestructible stability of the principles themselves in the face of any ideological encroachments and attacks from whatever quarter. Lenin always regarded Marxist principles as living entities, constantly developing and reproducing themselves, and alien to both opportunist vagueness and doctrinaire-dogmatic fossilization.

Socialist ideology is revolutionary and critical at every phase and stage of its evolution. Under developed socialism its revolutionary-critical essence implies above all:

- active gearing of ideological factors and moral resources to the effort to solve current pressing problems in the socio-economic, socio-political and cultural fields;

- opening-up of new horizons of social knowledge, constant critical verification of the results achieved and the practical changes effected, the raising of the theoretical and practical value of scientific research, the disclosure of the importance and implications of social problems for the life of the individual and his own set of values;

- consistent implementation of the principle of commitment to the Party's ideals, the overcoming of subjectivist and doctrinaire approaches to reality, the ability to understand and treat reality as a movement of existing contradictions.

The Soviet Communist Party emphasizes the fundamental importance of criticism and self-criticism in every area of the life of society—in science, culture, education and economic activity. This is a matter of a realistic attitude to the results achieved, of a responsible attitude to the job in hand, of a sense of purpose and persistence in overcoming difficulties and drawbacks which still impede the progress of Soviet society.

Criticism and self-criticism is a creative communist method of building the new society, based on the social and productive activity of the broad masses, on their sense of being master of the country and shared interest in the common cause. The 25th Congress of the CPSU fully explained the broad social context in which the Party

tackled this question which is crucial for the life of Soviet society. The CPSU sees the encouragement of criticism and self-criticism as directly contributing to the implementation of its programme, as facilitating the search for and tapping of all latent reserves and potentialities of a developed socialist society, and the advantages it offers.

The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and subsequent Party documents make a special point of reiterating that criticism and self-criticism is an indispensable and permanent condition of further progress in every area of Soviet society. This approach was given a legislative enactment in the new Constitution of the USSR, where Article 49 states: "Every citizen of the USSR has the right to submit proposals to state bodies and public organisations for improving their activity, and to criticise shortcomings in their work.

"Officials are obliged, within established time-limits, to examine citizens' proposals and requests, to reply to them, and to take appropriate action.

"Persecution for criticism is prohibited."

The revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology synthesizes three of its basic qualities: scientific content, class character and adherence to Party principles. These qualities are not anything that has been artificially introduced into the sphere of knowledge but are natural attributes of an adequate reflection of social being in scientific ideology.

Criticizing the opportunist views of Russian Mensheviks Lenin wrote: "The revolutionary dialectics of Marxist realism, which emphasises the urgent tasks of the advanced class... are absolutely alien to them."¹ "The revolutionary dialectics of Marxist realism" may be viewed as synonymous with socialist ideology. The materialistic interpretation of history and the class view of scientific ideology are incompatible with illusory, religious consciousness, with any mythology. This principled ideological line of the Communist Party springs from the deep-seated foundations of its world outlook and its class-oriented positions.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Revolution Teaches", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 149.

The realism of socialist ideology is behind its opposition to all forms of illusory consciousness, of *a priori* constructions of reality. Lenin defined his attitude to this issue at the dawn of the revolutionary proletarian movement in Russia when he called for abandoning illusions and for seeking support in the actual, and not the desired development of Russia, in actual and not possible social-economic relations.¹

In the course of his struggle against the subjectivism of the liberal-minded Narodniks and the objectivism of the "legal Marxists" (both opposed the revolutionary essence of Marx's doctrine) Lenin showed the conditions under which ideals and ideological principles take on a scientifically sound character and can thus serve as a guide to action in social life. Whereas in subjectivist sociology an ideal is an utopian construction resting on the rickety foundation of "aspirations" and "sentiments" of men, divorced from their real economic basis, the objectivist approach fails to identify the dominant trends in social development and the class interests behind those trends.

For all the seeming opposition of subjectivism and objectivism in their approach to social phenomena they share far more common elements than those that divide them. The objectivist description and collection of facts always suffers, paradoxical as it may sound at first glance, from subjectivism since it lacks effective criteria for the selection, classification and evaluation of the facts collected. This produces a situation where, out of all the assemblage of facts, either random facts are selected or only those which are preferable and desirable.

Lenin pointed out in this connection: "In practice, it is the class struggle, and not my very best wishes, that will determine the building of a new Russia. My ideals of building a new Russia will not be chimerical only if they express the interests of an actually existing class, whose living conditions compel it to act in a particular sense."² A scientific ideal differs from an utopia, firstly,

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 297.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Political Line", *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 330.

in that it is based on a strictly scientific analysis of reality and singles out in the mosaic-like picture of numerous socio-economic and political phenomena, dominant trends which determine the chief, rather than secondary, directions of social development and, secondly, if it is indissolubly linked with the interests of the advanced class, for which the realization of the dominant trend is the ultimate goal of its struggle, a goal that stems from its objective position under the given system of social relations. Once these conditions are satisfied an ideal serves as a scientifically sound guide to action in working for the future, a guide that expresses both an historical necessity and the actions of a particular class to translate this necessity into effect. Scientific ideology in this way gives an "anticipatory" reflection of reality.

Scientifically sound ideals have an organizing role to play in the revolutionary struggle and the construction of the new society as they inspire the masses, consolidate their unity, open up before them an adequate scope for action in the arena of history, and reveal the social importance and meaning of their routine, day-to-day activities.

An ideal in socialist practice thus has a twofold (dual) significance: on the one hand it shows that pragmatic practicicism is wrong as it fails to open up future prospects, and on the other, it demonstrates that voluntarism is also wrong since it implies the artificial introduction of new social forms disregarding the degree of maturity of material conditions and social consciousness at the given point in time and means an attempt to by-pass, "skip" objectively necessary stages and phases of historical development.

Unlike a slogan which formulates a specific task for a particular class at a particular stage of social development, an ideal expresses strategic, ultimate goals of its struggle and activities.

Running through all of Lenin's works is the idea of the fundamental unity of cognitive and social-class nature of socialist ideology. It is impossible to study reality, Lenin emphasized, "*without qualifying it, without appraising it from the Marxist, or the liberal, or the reactionary, etc., point of view!*"¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Liberal and Marxist Conceptions of the Class Struggle", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 123.

The social orientation of knowledge has always been the target of bourgeois critics who are careful to mask their own partisanship by an "objective" approach. The most comprehensive philosophical exposition of bourgeois objectivism is to be found in Mannheim's sociology of knowledge which is the Bible of almost all of today's Western sociologists. Attacking the Marxist thesis on the clearly-defined social orientation of cognition of social phenomena, Mannheim claimed that knowledge can be true if the search for it is conducted simultaneously from different positions with due account being taken of different social forms of world outlook. It is necessary, he wrote, to achieve a certain openness with regard to the possible addition to our knowledge coming from an appreciation of other different social positions. Thus, an ideology free from assessment which Mannheim laid claim to having developed is, in actual fact, little more than a fiction. Social incompatibility is every bit as real as biological incompatibility.

A class position is present in any social knowledge of reality whether this position is openly acknowledged or is carefully camouflaged. A class-oriented approach and assessment spring from the objective nature of social relations which represent the practical interests of different social forces. Lenin emphasized that "economic interests and the economic position of the classes which rule our state lie at the root of both our home and foreign policy. These propositions ... constitute the basis of the Marxist world outlook ...".¹

The reality of class interests which find a visible and tangible manifestation in every area of the domestic and international policies of classes and states is becoming increasingly more difficult for bourgeois ideologists to deny. This explains the increasingly subtle, sophisticated forms of falsification of the real substance of the problem, the attempt "to subjectivize" class interests, to reduce them to the common denominator of "sentiments" and "shared suffering" by a large group of people from particular situations that arise in life. However, to judge of

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Report on Foreign Policy Delivered at a Joint Meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet, May 14, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 365.

a class position on the basis of "shared reaction" is about as wise as trying to judge of the real character of an individual on the basis of his own opinion of himself, what he feels and experiences.

A class interest takes shape not on the basis of "shared reaction" and "experiences", since the "reaction" and "experiences" represent the superstructure over quite definite conditions of existence. Besides, the intensity of "reaction" or to be more precise, the level of awareness of a class position can and does vary widely from one group to another within one and the same class. This depends on many variables including political experience, educational standard, occupation, traditions, class education, etc. But basically, a class position is shaped by the objective status of the given class within the socio-economic, and political structure of society, by what this class actually is and what it does. It is precisely on the evidence of millions of hard facts of everyday life which determine and characterize the face of a class that the real content of its "experiences" and its social psychology can be deduced.

Scientific ideology is characterized by a social determinism in its approach to forms of consciousness as well as to economic and political phenomena. Lenin pointed out: "Is this not obscurantism when determinism is confined to the field of 'investigation', while in the field of morality, social activity and all fields other than 'investigation' the question is left to a 'subjective' estimate?"¹ Lenin's methodology for the study of different forms of consciousness does not countenance the artificial separation of the spheres of exploration and assessment. Exploration without assessment leads straight to objectivism. On the other hand, assessment is the result of exploration rather than its anticipation or prejudgement. Otherwise the result is subjectivist tendentiousness.

In contrast to both the subjectivist and objectivist approach to reality the Marxist approach is based on an objective analysis of social development. This approach presupposes the disclosure of social antagonisms and contradictions, the identification of the motive social forces and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Theory of Knowledge", *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 191.

dominant trends of social progress and due consideration of all the class interests involved. An analysis of ideological forms which represent the theoretical refraction of all of these factors in social consciousness from different class positions, can be scientifically sound if approached from this angle.

On the issue of the link between ideology and class interest Lenin opposed attempts to belittle the importance of Marxism as the theoretical consciousness of the working class and at the same time demonstrated the many different facets and specific features and the mediated character of the links between different forms of social consciousness and practical political tasks.

Criticizing the vulgarized views of the Russian opportunists Potresov and Bazarov who sought to establish a direct connection between the philosophical categories of time and space and the social and political struggle of the working class Lenin wrote: "It is wrong to say that 'the most abstract theses [of Engels against Dühring] were actually of vital and concrete significance to the German working-class movement'. The significance of Engels' most abstract theses was that they explained to the ideologists of the working class what was erroneous in the shift from materialism towards positivism and idealism."¹ The references made by Potresov and Bazarov to "the vital and concrete significance of Engels' most abstract theses for the German working-class movement" were qualified by Lenin as "high-sounding, but hollow, phrases."² At the same time, the Marxist interpretation of the link between ideology and real life does not admit of any neglect of theoretical problems which are linked to social and political practice indirectly, through a series of oblique links. The most abstract propositions of social theoretical knowledge being inextricably linked with its whole content thus acquire an ideological significance affecting men's world outlook.

The concrete expression of class positions at the scientific level is adherence to Party principles which is an indispensable condition for and the most accurate indi-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Those Who Would Liquidate Us", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 73.

² *Ibid.*

cator of the level of the political maturity of a particular class.

The founders of scientific ideology have always emphasized the open Party-oriented nature of a revolutionary world outlook, the objective, real socio-economic and political substance of a class interest which finds its adequate theoretical expression in scientific ideology. Bourgeois-liberal "critics" of Marxism have always accused Marxism of its allegedly "excessive polemical nature" which militates against assimilation of its scientific content.

Marxist ideology cannot help to be polemical and Party-oriented in nature. Lenin explained: "'Marx's system' is of a 'polemical nature', not because it is 'tendentious', but because it provides an exact picture, in theory, of all the contradictions that are present in reality. For this reason, incidentally, all attempts to master 'Marx's system' without mastering its 'polemical nature' are and will continue to be unsuccessful: the 'polemical nature' of the system is nothing more than a true reflection of the 'polemical nature' of capitalism itself."¹ There are two kinds of polemical nature, subjectivist and one expressing the intrinsic, objective, "polemical nature" of an object which cannot be "neutral" towards different classes.

At present bourgeois propagandists are again resurrecting and launching as yet another "intellectualist fashion"—the tale of the supposedly dual content of Marxism. This particular tale is based on the artificial division of Marxism into its "scientific" and "ideological" parts in an attempt to find in it two different motives—the positivist-scientific and the revolutionary-romantic ones. Whereas bourgeois propagandists give a qualified recognition to the cognitive value of the former they proclaim the latter to be unscientific, arbitrary as something artificially transplanted into the realm of scientific knowledge from the sphere of agitation and propaganda.

This tactic has deep roots in the history of the struggle of bourgeois ideologists against Marxism. Today it is impossible to blockade Marxism ideologically. When the first volume of *Capital* was published the bourgeois press at-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Once More on the Theory of Realisation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 85.

tempted to organize a conspiracy of silence against it. Today when Marxism has become the leading ideology of the 20th century such tactics doesn't work. So bourgeois ideologists are having to reckon with the growing influence of socialist ideology, with the growing interest in the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Hence, their frequent "recognition" and especially "semi-recognition" of Marxism.

Today many sociologists in the West describe Marx as a pioneer in the study of human consciousness, one of the founders of the theory of ideology without which no contemporary concept of consciousness with any claim to a scientific nature, can very well do. But for all these "acknowledgements" bourgeois sociologists put Marx in the same rank with bourgeois sociologists like Pareto and Mannheim and attempt to obliterate the fundamental difference between the Marxist doctrine of ideology and bourgeois concepts. To this end the tale of a "dual nature of Marxism" has been manufactured and is now being exploited, a tale about Marxism's scientific and unscientific parts, about the incompatibility of science and Party principles, etc. Speaking of the relationship between science and partisanship in the terms in which the bourgeois interpreters of Marx are doing it is about as profound and relevant as getting in an argument over what a man needs more—his head or his heart?

Vain attempts are being made to present the Party spirit of socialist ideology, its monolithic and integral conceptual nature as narrow-mindedness and limited world outlook. The bourgeois critics of Marxism are very fond of making themselves out as opponents of dogmatism and doctrinaire approach, they assure one and all that the interpretation of phenomena through a single concept is allegedly always arbitrary and biased. However, as a rule, the absence of a single concept serves only as a cover-up for dodges and evasions in the face of problems that demand an only choice and a clear-cut unequivocal assessment. Therefore all claims of bourgeois sociologists to having developed a system of "social equations" which would be suitable for any historico-political view and would equally satisfy all social-class positions have been and remain vain. Mannheim has made the most serious attempt of this kind. He set his "sociology of knowledge"

the task of identifying in each specific piece of "knowledge" an element conditioned by a definite assessment, social position and interests and eliminate these elements as a source of error and then to penetrate the real content of knowledge "free from assessment", "supra-social" and "supra-historical". Mannheim failed to solve the problem because it was wrongly posed. Social cognition is always conducted from definite social position, it moves within clearly defined social coordinates and far from any social position presupposes misconceptions and "straying off course" in cognition. Finally, a "freedom from assessment" is just another form of assessment. The allegedly extra-Party nature of bourgeois ideology conceals camouflaged class motives and interests.

The theoretical substantiation and practical realization of the working class's mission in world history is the dominant idea of Marxist-Leninist ideology, the expression of a clear-cut class view of social phenomena and processes.

Another pet argument of bourgeois propagandists is their assertion that the proletarian class character of socialist ideology allegedly leads to an infringement of the interests of other social groups, such as the peasantry and the intelligentsia. The record of existing socialism to date has given the lie to quite a few slanderous inventions of bourgeois ideologists about the working class. In contrast to all the classes that have dominated human society at different stages of history the proletariat is the only class whose actions have not been marked by self-interest and narrow selfishness.

No other class in human history can match the proletariat's courage and capacity for self-denial, nor its sense of duty to society. No other class in human history has done more than the proletariat for common weal upon coming to power by directing the entire state machine at the social, political and spiritual emancipation of the popular masses; no other class has done more for the development of the creative powers of every social group and stratum capable of making an active contribution to the construction of the new society.

There has been no other class in history that could match the proletariat's lofty goals, the scope of its historical action and the extent and depth of its impact on the rest of society. Lenin saw the working class as the indes-

tractible bulwark of socialism, capable of enduring all trials, hardships and privations, capable of making great sacrifices which history inevitably imposes on those who are the first to break with the past and blaze the trail boldly to a better future, on those who disdain philistine values, who can inspire respect for their capacity for constructive effort, respect for all those who work honestly for the good of their fellow-men.

Developing the seminal ideas of the founders of scientific socialism on the social and political mission of the working class Lenin concluded: "Only this class can help the working masses unite, rally their ranks and conclusively defend, conclusively consolidate and conclusively build a communist society."¹

A salient feature of the Marxist class analysis is the identification of a specific historical framework within which a particular process not only originates but also develops, and the clear-cut establishment of its qualitative characteristics. The solution of this methodological task is complicated by a series of impinging factors. Different socio-economic content at times manifests itself in real life dressed in the same or similar ideological clothes and on the contrary, different political and ideological terminology may conceal the same or similar content. Lenin demonstrated this using the example of Russian peasant socialism and the petty-bourgeois forms of socialism which were characteristic of the 1848-49 revolution in France. Referring to the similarity of ideological clothing Lenin wrote: "Both are certainly declamations of a bourgeois democrat *vaguely* expressing the real historical content of the struggle. The declamations of the Trudovik, however, *vaguely* express the actual *aims of the bourgeois* revolution which objective conditions make possible (i. e., make possible a peasant agrarian revolution in twentieth-century Russia), whereas the declamations of the French Kleinburger in 1848 *vaguely* expressed the aims of the *socialist* revolution, which was impossible in France in the middle of the last century."² As a result, in the former

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 292.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution 1905-1907", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 397.

case we have an essentially realistic programme albeit expressed in an illusory-ideological form while in the latter, an utopian programme, deprived of any specific socio-economic content in the context of the historical conditions that had taken shape in France by the mid-19th century.

Lenin's analysis of the Russian variety of peasant socialism shows that a comprehensive assessment of ideological systems is possible only on the basis of identifying the mechanism of their functioning in a concrete historical situation, in the context of conflicting tendencies, ideologies and classes. Marx, Engels and Lenin discovered the following paradoxical situation: that which is false in a formal economic sense, may, under a certain set of social circumstances and given a certain turn of events, become true in a historical sense, in other words, the real requirements of historical development may find expression even in the illusory forms of ideology.

The true nature of peasant socialism as an ideology, however, *did not reside in what its architects saw to be its true nature*. Peasant socialism remained false as a *socialist* doctrine but it acquired a real meaning as an expression of *democratic* aspirations of Russian peasants, as a definite democratic ideological trend. Lenin demonstrated the extreme complexity and heterogeneity of this social phenomenon, its internal ideological contradictions and complexity. Peasant socialism contained many different elements as far apart from one another as democratic aspirations, utopian socialism, petty-bourgeois reformism and the conservatism of the petty bourgeois.

Marxist class principles enable one not only establish the specific socio-economic content of social phenomena and processes but also, and this is of equal importance, to analyze the different forms of consciousness which reflect the course of history differently owing to their different refraction in the prism of different classes and social groups depending on their social positions. Revolutionary periods of history supply an especially abundant amount of material for such an analysis. These periods are of fundamental importance for the verification of ideological systems. Whereas in pre-revolutionary periods different ideologies and doctrines are merely compared, during revolutions different ideologies and trends are in confrontation in practical terms and that which until

then was concealed or camouflaged in ideology comes in to the open.

In his *Sketch of a Provisional Revolutionary Government*,¹ written at the time of the first Russian revolution of 1905, Lenin provided a group social portrait of Russia's society adding to the description of each class and each social group of any importance, apart from all the other parameters, the parameter of its level of consciousness and organization which he regarded as a factor directly involved in a revolutionary situation.

A revolution does not recognize the neutrals, it makes all classes and social strata reveal themselves through positive action. To show the extent of the polarization of Russia's society into two opposed forces Lenin wrote: "Finally, the revolution has obliged *this* 'popular force' to come into the open—the force of the tsar's adherents. It has revealed to the general view whom the tsar's rule banks on, and who really supports that rule. There you have it, this army of ferocious policemen, martinet-trained, half-witted soldiers, priests run wild, brutal shopkeepers, and the vodka-dazed riff-raff of capitalist society. Our Vendée has not yet said its last word either ... it is just beginning to deploy its forces properly. It, too, has its 'reserves of combustibles', accumulated during centuries of ignorance, oppression, serfdom, and police omnipotence. It combines within itself unmitigated Asiatic backwardness with all the loathsome features of the refined methods used to exploit and stultify those that are most downtrodden and tormented by the civilisation of the capitalist cities, and been reduced to conditions worse than those of wild beasts. This Vendée will not vanish at any manifesto from the tsar ... or at changes in the upper or lower ranks of the bureaucracy. It can be smashed only by the strength of an organised and enlightened proletariat, for only the proletariat, exploited as it is, is capable of rousing all that stand below it, awaken in them a sense that they are human beings and citizens, show them the path of deliverance from all exploitations."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Sketch of a Provisional Revolutionary Government", *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, pp. 534-36.

² V. I. Lenin, "Between Two Battles", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, pp. 463-64.

This vivid picture of Russia's social conditions at the time displays a Marxist class approach to social phenomena when classes and large social groups are examined in their movement, in their attitude to power (the crucial issue of revolution) and in relations to one another. What is analyzed is not only their real economic interests and political goals but also the level of their consciousness and organization. These two factors constitute an important social element which will be playing an increasingly important role in deciding the ultimate outcome of the confrontation between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution.

Apart from its general methodological value Lenin's analysis is remarkable in another respect. It is staple argument of bourgeois propagandists to assert that the Communists allegedly see the poverty of the exploited masses as a source of revolutionary ideas and their revolutionary action. The fact of the matter is, however, that Marxists have never idealized poverty and need since they keep the masses ignorant, benighted and prone to political infantilism. Lenin wrote: "... Political ignorance ... is to be seen, in part, in ... inability to look for exact proofs concerning controversial and important historical questions, and in the naive credence that they give to shouting and expostulation, and to the assurances and vows made by people with interests at stake."¹

The revolution and counter-revolution in France in the mid-19th century, in Russia in 1905-07, Hitler's rise to power in Germany in 1933, the establishment of a military-fascist dictatorship in Chile and other events that occurred in widely different conditions and periods, clearly demonstrated who exploited poverty, ignorance and prejudice, who deliberately cultivated and fomented them and who took advantage of them for reactionary ends. Present-day critics of Marxism-Leninism have been carefully evading these object lessons of history which show who stood to gain from moods of hopelessness and despair, products of poverty and need, who and how exploited them.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Notes of a Publicist", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 228.

2. Theory, Propaganda, Practice

Lenin pointed out that the development of the consciousness of the masses remains the basis and chief content of all ideological work while the task of convincing the masses will always be among the important tasks of government.¹ These definitions of Lenin's disclose the place and role of the ideological aspects of the work of the Communist Party, in the management of social processes. They show its *content—the development of the political consciousness of the masses*, its *task—that of educating the masses*, and the *method of doing so—through persuasion*.

Socialism as a theoretical principle and as real practical activity furnishes the necessary basis for the establishment of an organic unity of ideological and scientific criteria of the shaping of social consciousness.

To be sure, it does not mean automatism in effecting a unity of ideological and theoretical scientific criteria and principles in the formation of consciousness under socialism. No automatism exists not only because the resistance of survivals of the past has to be overcome along with the influence of ideology alien to socialism but also because this unity is inherent in the nature of socialism as one of its objective prerequisites. Their realization calls for an effective mechanism for the functioning of socialist ideology, for constant correlation of the tasks of ideological work, education, agitation and propaganda with concrete socio-economic and political problems arising before a socialist society at every stage of its evolution. It calls for taking into account the social and cultural characteristics of different sections of the population, the character and specific features of the participation of different social groups in socialist and communist construction, for continuing improvement of the content, forms and methods of ideological activity. Finally, it presupposes development of the Marxist-Leninist theory in a creative spirit, its orientation toward the exploration of new, topical problems and phenomena of social life.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Lessons of the Moscow Uprising", *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 178; "Original Version of the Article 'The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government'", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 68.

Thus, the peculiarities and advantages of socialist ideology as a scientific ideology reveal themselves to the full given certain objective and subjective prerequisites, persistent and target-oriented efforts by the ideological institutions of society and demand scientific management of ideological processes and mastering the art of guiding the political education of the masses.

The ideological activity of the Communist Party is a complex and many-faceted effort embracing all the principal areas of social life: economic activity and politics, production and science, culture and morality. It is associated with tackling in a creative spirit a wide range of theoretical scientific problems as well as practical problems of organization.

Ideological work aimed at moulding and educating man as the main asset of socialist society is a direct duty and concern of the Communist Party. It forms an integral part of Party leadership and guidance at every sector of communist construction.

One of the necessary conditions of a scientifically sound approach to ideological work is a comprehensive solution to all the problems encountered in this work, in the overall context of tasks facing society at every stage of its evolution. This makes it imperative for those involved in ideological work to take into account and analyze all changes occurring on the international scene and at home, in the economy, culture and science through the prism of their social consequences, of their influence on routine every-day life, on men's working and living conditions, on the consciousness, psychology and sentiments of men. Outside such an analysis a scientific approach remains either a dead letter or worse becomes a vogue phrase and leads to hide-bound ways camouflaged by the trappings of science.

It is wrong to regard ideological work as a sphere of pure abstract consciousness or of production technology. Ideological work is a sphere of human relations. Hence the importance of taking into account the entire range of factors which determine and influence these relations. Hence the need for a precise scientific analysis of social phenomena. Such an analysis reveals the possibilities of the progressive development of positive factors and of the neutralization of negative ones. It de-

termines permanent and temporary, external and internal characteristics which in turn create optimum conditions for ideological influence and make them an integral part of ideological practice. Social facts are the basis and criterion of ideological activity, its point of departure and ultimate result. Whatever area of human endeavour in socialist society we take, be it economic activity, production, everyday life, culture, community living, etc., everywhere the index of the effectiveness of ideological and educational efforts is the level of consciousness, organization and sense of responsibility of the men involved which is expressed in practical terms in the social actions of individuals.

Thus, ideological activity is not a process of self-movement by pure consciousness in which abstract ideas and symbols rather than living individuals are involved as counterparts. At the same time, ideological and educational work is not an area of subject-object relationships either, which can be "encoded" into a given production technology in a sufficiently representative range of manipulative operations with the object of ideological and educational work. The fact that human beings with their consciousness, free choice, established attitudes to life and range of interests, enter into ideological relationships determines the chief special features of the management of ideological processes. This makes it extremely difficult to measure the actual impact of ideological and educational efforts whose ultimate criterion is not the display of particular external behavioural "signs and symbols" but rather the internal level of consciousness, organization and sense of responsibility of individuals, i.e., subjective factors whose state is at times difficult or impossible to register, and still less to take into account, before practical situations develop which bring them out to the full.

The question of the effectiveness of ideological work is, at the same time, a matter of its relevance to and connection with real life.

The record of the evolution of Soviet society to date, indicates that the link between ideology and the practical construction of socialism and communism can be strengthened not through empiricism, nor through dissolving ideological problems in the totality of current

specialized questions and problems tackled by a society but rather through making the theoretical analysis of the social process more profound, through a better ability to relate today's developments and problems of social life to the long-range prospects and practice of social progress. At the same time, if ideological activity is to avoid falling into the vicious circle of generalities it cannot afford to detach itself from current changes affecting the economic and spiritual life of society. Prompt response of propaganda to every new event and development, a sober, realistic analysis of "the now" in the life of society not only helps shape public opinion in desired ways, channelling it into desired ideological directions and making it scientifically sound, but also in creating an overall atmosphere of trust which is essential for the maximum effectiveness of ideological work.

In his *What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* Lenin underscored Karl Liebknecht's words "Studieren, Propagandieren, Organisieren"¹ as a correct definition of the tasks of the socialist ideology. "To study, to propagandize, to organize" sums up the meaning of ideological activity as seen by Lenin. This formula captures well its full essence which determines the content and character of ideological work: its scientific nature, social activity and practical effectiveness.

Pragmatism is alien to socialist practice which has always developed on the basis of clearly-defined ideological prospectives. The record of the three revolutions in Russia, the history of socialist construction in the USSR indicate that in carrying out all social changes the Communist Party founded by Lenin was careful to single out the ideological aspect of these changes and to determine on this basis the concrete content of its ideological activity at the given stage of social progress.

Economic activity, production, everyday life and culture have their specific ideological aspects. Ideological problems are refracted in a peculiar way, differently in

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 298.

every specialized sphere of social life. It is essential to isolate this ideological aspect, to determine its place in social life and all its possible consequences, to find specific methods of solving the problem ideologically. Herein lies one of the greatest challenges of ideological work which calls for a scientific approach and an acute political intuition, a high degree of professionalism.

An analysis of the substantive aspects of the problem of developing a socialist consciousness among members of a society will reveal a threefold complex of factors which determine and influence the course of ideological processes in a socialist society—theory, propaganda and practice. Only a comprehensive consideration of the dialectical interaction of these factors makes the management of the ideological development of a society really effective. The fact that Lenin made the unity of these factors in ideological activity directly related to the implementation by the Party of its leadership and guiding role indicates the importance he attached to them. Lenin wrote: "You cannot be an ideological leader without... theoretical work, just as you cannot be one without directing this work to meet the needs of the cause, and without spreading the results of this theory..."¹

Theoretical work and propaganda are two inalienable aspects of ideological activity. They cannot be identified any more than they can be opposed. Theory lends scientific clarity to propaganda while propaganda gives theory a practical and effective potency.

Disclosing the relationship between practical propaganda and scientific and theoretical activity Lenin wrote: "On the contrary, the practical work of propaganda and agitation must always take precedence, because, firstly, theoretical work only supplies answers to the problems raised by practical work."² Theory can fulfil its function only when it relies on actual experience, only then can it supply answers to problems real life poses. On the other hand, propaganda must measure up to the standard of the theoretical exposition of the tasks facing society as a whole.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 298.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 297-98.

Lenin saw the fundamental task of propaganda in the political education of the masses, in organizing them for practical action. The Soviet Communist Party has solved this problem at every stage of its revolutionary struggle and construction of a new society.

The problem of "the conscious" and "the spontaneous" was fully elaborated by Lenin in his *What Is To Be Done?* It is not a matter of chance that this particular work has been the target of the most violent attacks by the bourgeois and revisionist critics of Marxism. Thus Roger Garaudy has for the past decade been claiming that Lenin had "borrowed" the basic propositions contained in *What Is To Be Done?* from Kautsky. In his book *Lénine* Garaudy writes: "It would be a great mistake and a dangerous one to try and be guided by the ideas contained in *What Is To Be Done?* in defining Lenin's concept of the party."¹

The founders of Marxism-Leninism regarded the problem of linking the socialist consciousness with the workers' movement as one of creating a revolutionary party of the proletariat. This is precisely the interpretation of this problem given by Lenin who wrote: "We see in all European countries a constantly growing urge to fuse socialism with the working-class movement in a single *Social-Democratic* movement.... By directing socialism towards a fusion with the working-class movement. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels did their greatest service: they created a revolutionary theory that explained the necessity for this fusion and gave socialists the task of organising the class struggle of the proletariat."² When he wrote about socialist consciousness Lenin, far from repeating Kautsky as Roger Garaudy is trying to make out, was developing the ideas of Marx and Engels.

Lenin's concept of introducing socialist ideology into the spontaneous working-class movement is traceable to the cardinal idea of Marx and Engels that only by rallying "round *revolutionary Socialism*", "round *Communism*" proletariat acquires its own free historical move-

¹ Roger Garaudy, *Lénine*, Paris, 1968, p. 20.

² V. I. Lenin, "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 257-58.

ment.¹ The attempts to pit the views of Marx against those of Lenin have been no more successful than the attempts to present socialist ideology as something alien to the working class that has been imposed upon it and that cramps its initiative.

The methodological distortion of the problem by the critics of Leninism consists in the absolute opposition between "spontaneity" and "consciousness". They falsify Lenin's view of this question. The necessity of introducing socialist consciousness into the workers' movement is justified on the grounds that, above all, this consciousness is scientific and as such cannot be developed spontaneously. Socialist ideology is an instrument of the class organization of the proletariat, an instrument of self-discovery, a tool of the political and ideological consolidation of the proletariat as a class, of its conversion from "a class in itself" into "a class for itself". This historic task cannot be tackled by allowing the workers' movement to develop spontaneously because this can only generate an "economic" mentality. This problem has a particularly modern ring today when capitalism is assiduously trying to impose on the working people "consumer" attitudes and mentality.

Lenin never metaphysically opposed "spontaneous" and "conscious" elements. Lenin's concept proceeds from the realization that "the spontaneous element", in essence, represents nothing more nor less than consciousness in an *embryonic form*...² The attempt "to shift the blame entirely upon the absence of conditions", on the impact of the material sphere alone, i.e., a passive approach to ideological activity has been qualified by Lenin as "the infatuation of the 'ideologists' with their own shortcomings".³ By consistently sticking to its materialistic positions on all social and ideological issues, the Bolsheviks led by Lenin from the very start of their ideological work had regarded them as a substantive and

active form of activity and as a factor directly influencing the workers' movement and the course of history.

Since its inception in 1903 as an ideological trend and a political party Bolshevism always rejected two erroneous trends in ideological activities: on the one hand, its divorce from the material conditions of everyday life which makes it degenerate into day-dreaming and phrasemongering, and, on the other, when an attempt is made to blame everything on "the absence of conditions" which dooms ideology to passivity and inertness. This highly principled point of view which was substantiated by Lenin when he was putting together the Bolshevik Party was subsequently developed by him in his later works and became the corner-stone of the ideological activity of all Soviet Communists.

Present-day critics of Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* pass over in silence (and this is not a matter of chance) the fact that the problem of "spontaneity" and "consciousness" is resolved by Lenin in the context of opposition between bourgeois and socialist ideologies. Lenin emphasized: "...the *only* choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology."¹ Here the opposition is absolute and straight-forward since there is no and can be no middle ground. Therefore any glorification of the spontaneity of the workers' movement in the ideological and political respect would result in a diminution of the significance of socialist ideology and in a greater influence of bourgeois ideology.

Lenin, refuting the anti-Marxist allegations that socialist ideology had been imposed on the workers' movement, showed that the proletariat embraced the scientific ideology as their own for two reasons: firstly, socialist ideology defined more profoundly and precisely than any other ideology the interests of the working class and secondly, the objective position of the working class makes it easier for it to assimilate socialist ideology just like the objective position of the petty-bourgeois strata of Russia's society makes their socialist re-education after the victory of a proletarian revolution a very difficult task indeed.

¹ K. Marx, "The Class Struggle in France". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 282.

² V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 374.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 384.

3. The Socialist Consciousness and the Experience of the Masses

A revolutionary party of the working class is the product of the blend between the workers' movement and socialism. Lenin defined one of the party's main tasks at inception as promoting the political development and political organization of the working class.¹ To Lenin the successful fulfillment of this task was unthinkable outside the masses' own political experience. He wrote: "Surely there is no need to prove to Social-Democrats that there can be no political education except through political struggle and political action. Surely it cannot be imagined that any sort of study circles or books, etc., can politically educate the masses of workers if they are kept away from political activity and political struggle."² *That is the way Lenin formulated the question as early as before the first Russian revolution of 1905.*

Today's critics of Leninism are seeking to artificially oppose *What Is To Be Done?* to Lenin's works written between 1905 and 1907, the years of the first Russian revolution. This is being done in an attempt to prove that in *What Is To Be Done?*, written in 1902, Lenin was a "Kautskyite" while in his works of 1905-07 Lenin was a "Leninist". They assert that in the initial period of his activities Lenin was under the influence of Kautsky's "economic materialism" and because of this he underestimated the role of the historical initiative of the working class and the masses' own political experience. Roger Garaudy writes: "In his *What Is To Be Done?* written in 1902 Lenin defined the principles of the organization of an underground party which had to operate in conditions of intense struggle against a terrorist tsarist dictatorship. Lenin laid the emphasis, quite justifiably at the time, on military discipline and centralism (but nowhere in this book does he ever refer to 'democratic centralism'). In 1917 in a quite different set of circumstances, Lenin, on the contrary, extolled 'the histo-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Urgent Tasks of Our Movement", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 368.

² V. I. Lenin, "Apropos of the *Profession De Foi*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 288.

ric initiative' of the popular masses and their creative spontaneity." Revisionist critics see an unresolvable contradiction between Lenin's propositions on the introduction of the socialist consciousness and the impossibility of an effective education of the masses outside the framework of independent political activities and revolutionary struggle.

The introduction of the socialist consciousness and the masses' own political experience (and we mean political experience since dishonest critics are careful to evade the question of just what kind of experience Lenin had in mind)—these are two aspects of the single process of socialist education.

Nor are the assertions that Lenin had allegedly raised the question of the significance of the political experience of the working class and broad popular masses only in connection with experience of the 1905-07 revolution and the October 1917 revolution, in agreement with the historical facts. As early as 1894, at the dawn of the proletarian movement in Russia, Lenin in his work *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* defined the position of Russia's Social-Democrats on this fundamentally important question. He wrote: "In this emphasising the necessity, importance and immensity of the theoretical work of the Social-Democrats, I by no means want to say that this work should take precedence over PRACTICAL work,—still less that the latter should be postponed until the former is completed. Only the admirers of the 'subjective method in sociology', or the followers of utopian socialism, could arrive at such a conclusion."²

That is then, the true historical background to the issue. It is understandable that Lenin should pay special attention to the political experience of the masses in connection with the revolutionary tasks of 1905 arguing with every justification that one day of full-scale revolution was worth years of relatively "peaceful development" in terms of acquiring political experience.

¹ Roger Garaudy, *Parole d'homme*, Paris, 1975, p. 197.

² V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 297-98.

To gain political experience of one's own is to learn to see all the classes of society in action when the correspondence of their ideological programmes to their practical behaviour is verified, which implies the testing of theoretical principles on the touchstone of practical activity. Lenin emphasized: "These truths, however, will be driven home to really broad masses of the proletariat only when these classes will have visible, tangible experience of the behaviour of the parties of one class or another, when the clear realisation of their class nature is supplemented by the immediate reaction of the proletarian mind to the whole character of the bourgeois parties."¹

Only through one's own political experience can one convert one's socialist knowledge into one's socialist convictions. Political experience on the one hand consolidates scientific knowledge, and on the other, is the most effective incentive to its acquisition and making sense of reality and social events. Lenin noted: "It was no mere chance that since the failure of the revolution (meaning the first Russian revolution of 1905-07—*N. B.*), all classes of society, the widest sections of the popular masses, have displayed a fresh interest to the very fundamentals of the world outlook, including the questions of religion and philosophy, and the principles of our Marxist doctrine as a whole; that was inevitable. It is no mere chance that the masses, whom the revolution drew into the sharp struggle over questions of tactics, have subsequently, in the period characterised by the absence of open struggle, shown a desire for general theoretical knowledge; that was inevitable. We must again explain the fundamentals of Marxism to these masses: the defence of Marxist theory is again on the order of the day."²

It is logical that in the aftermath of major political events, especially of major upheavals, there should always be inevitable interest in a re-appraisal of broad philosophical, ideological and moral problems. Each class re-examines its set of ideological principles and goals.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Notes of a Publicist", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 73.

² V. I. Lenin, "The State of Affairs in the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 35.

The period after the first Russian revolution of 1905-07 was marked by an intensive elaboration of the philosophical problems of Marxism and hotly-contested debate over ideological and theoretical issues, since each class was learning its own lessons taught by the revolution as each class prepared for the political battles lying ahead.

The counter-revolutionaries were also taking stock of the turbulent events of 1905-07. The years immediately after the defeat of the first Russian revolution saw a dramatic increase in the ideological reaction all along the line: as exemplified in the spread of idealist and mystic philosophies, the revival of decadent trends in art and literature, the revision of all democratic traditions of the Russian liberation movement. This period was marked by the deepening crisis and decay of ideology, by the most despicable renegade trends among the fair-weather fellow-travelers of the revolution. Lenin exposed the essence of these processes within the reaction's camp well when he wrote: "What we see in the 1908-10 period is... the result of the bourgeoisie having recognised itself as a class. It is mindful of the lessons received during the preceding three years and creating an ideology which in principle is hostile to socialism (not to European socialism, not to socialism in general, but specifically to Russian socialism) and to democracy."¹

This turn of events did not come as a surprise but was the logical result of the preceding struggle over the issue of the ideological continuity of the Russian revolutionary liberation movement from the days of Radishchev and the Decembrists to Herzen and Chernyshevsky. Marxism, far from having been artificially transplanted onto Russian soil, had been embraced by the best representatives of Russia's social thought after a long period of the liberation movement in Russia which had to contend with great difficulties and hardships, after a long period of agonizing and incessant quest for the right philosophy to adopt. The Social-Democratic movement and the Bolshevik Party had not grown up

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Social Structure of State Power, the Prospects and Liquidationism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 148.

outside the mainstream of the Russian liberation movement. Lenin regarded the proletarian era of Russia's liberation movement as a direct extension of the preceding stages of the liberation movement in the country. He demonstrated that the ideological heritage of the Russian liberation movement far from being a ballast was a living capital inherited by right and later developed and enriched by the Russian Social-Democrats, and the Communist Party. It was hardly an accident therefore that after the 1905-07 revolution the reaction concentrated its efforts on discrediting the Russian liberation movement as something that was devoid of any national roots, as something alien to Russian history. That was a struggle not only against revolutionary-democratic traditions. The reactionaries were fighting against a living opponent—Bolshevism, as a political and ideological trend and a worthy successor to the progressive ideas of the preceding liberation movement in Russia.

The idea of fusing socialist knowledge with the socialist experience of the masses is one of the dominant ideas of Marxism-Leninism running through every phase of the revolutionary struggle, through every stage of socialist and communist construction. After the victorious October Revolution Lenin developed this idea further. He wrote: "When this new class learns, not from books, not from meetings or lectures, but from the practical work of government... it will constitute a force which will brush away capitalism and all its survivals as easily as straw or dust."¹ Only by close involvement in social life and through participation in the running of the country, Lenin emphasized, could working people begin to learn on the basis of their own practical experience the science of socialist construction, and develop a new type of discipline.

These ideas provide a key to a scientific understanding of the essence of communist education: by steadily improving the means of ideological influence on the masses, by involving the masses in the day-to-day social and political activities, to help them to develop their own political experience as an indispensable condition for

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Report at the Second All-Russia Trade Union Congress, January 20, 1919", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 420.

developing a socialist consciousness and lofty ideological qualities. Direct social and political experience not only helps consolidate scientific knowledge but it also helps one develop a sense of political intuition and political habits without which no conscious social and political activity can be maintained.

The Soviet philosophical literature of recent years has been concentrating on the question of relationships between theoretical and everyday consciousness, between ideology and social psychology. In the context of propaganda activities this problem could be formulated as one of fitting lofty ideals and goals to the everyday, practical interests and concerns of ordinary people.

It is wrong to look upon a discussion of these questions as something far-fetched and artificial because it rests on quite real foundations since the attainment by socialism of a high degree of maturity gives an important new dimension to the problem of the two levels of consciousness—theoretical and everyday ones. In principle, the relationship between these two levels is not anything static or fixed rather it is dialectical, subject to change and dependent on the level of society's development, on the maturity of socialist social relations and the development of the human personality.

Having said that and especially in the context of present-day reality in the life of Soviet society we find it difficult to agree with those who tend to treat everyday consciousness as being ordinary worldly wisdom, as something primitive, immature and not up to socialist standards. It seems to us that were we to adopt this attitude and implement it consistently it would be impossible for us to give a rational explanation to quite a few matters of fundamental importance.

Indeed, it would be an oversimplification to pretend that the active participation of the masses in the social and political practical activities of society could only be based on the knowledge the masses gain through the various channels of propaganda, that this knowledge functions in the practical activities of the masses in "pure form", as it were, without being coloured by their life experience drawn from their everyday activities. But if we agree that "everyday consciousness" is nothing more but a routine, part of the daily grind of millions, we may

ask what form does the direct new experience gained in the course of practical participation in socialist and communist construction take in the minds of the masses? Quite clearly, it cannot take the form of theoretical knowledge overnight since the latter is the result of scientific study. Initially this experience is fixed in the minds of the masses on the level of their attitudes to the real world in the context of their spiritual and practical world outlook. Therefore, it would be far wiser to exercise great caution in qualifying the so-called "ordinary everyday" consciousness as something routine, hide-bound and primitive let alone as something typical of the philistine mentality. Suffice it to say that "naive realism" which asserts the objective nature of the material world has been deliberately made the foundation of the dialectical-materialistic theory of reflection.

It would be a one-sided approach to assume that "ordinary consciousness" embraces only the trivial, minor matters of everyday being, "the vanity of the vanities", matters of second and third rate importance. "Ordinary consciousness" (perhaps, "practical consciousness" would be a better way of putting it) reflects the everyday interests of men and these can cover an exceedingly wide range: from problems of war and peace and the current international situation to the upbringing of children and the state of affairs at one's place of work. The loftiest ideals and the most momentous events in the world are perceived by people through the prism of their own experience. People relate these events and ideals to their everyday life and formulate their attitude to major social, political and economic matters under the influence of these events and ideals. The Marxists have always attached great importance to these circumstances and took them into account in their political and propaganda activities.

The great importance attached by Marxist ideology and propaganda to theoretical knowledge has never implied a diminution of the importance of "ordinary consciousness" within which people sort out their own experience, their everyday concerns are reflected and the facts of life take on the dimension of broad generalizations and fundamental conclusions. Even at the dawn of the revolutionary proletarian movement in Russia Lenin raised these problems boldly when he stated in no uncertain terms

that "... the loftiest ideals are not worth a brass farthing so long as you fail to merge them indissolubly with the interests of those who participate in the economic struggle, to merge them with those 'narrow' and petty everyday problems of the given class, like that of a 'fair reward for labour', which the grandiloquent Narodnik regards with such sublime disdain".¹

After the victory of the October Revolution Lenin wrote in his *The Terms of Admission into the Communist International*: "Day-by-day propaganda and agitation must be genuinely communist in character.... The dictatorship of the proletariat should not be discussed merely as a stock phrase to be learned by rote; it should be popularised in such a way that the practical facts systematically dealt with in our press day by day will drive home to every rank-and-file working man and working woman, every soldier and peasant, that it is indispensable to them."²

In his speech at the Third Congress of the Komsomol Lenin reverted to the same theme when he said: "Work in common cannot be brought about all at once. That is impossible. It does not drop from the skies. It comes through toil and suffering; it is created in the course of struggle.... One's own experience of life is needed.... It is such experience that must form the basis of all the activities of the Young Communist League."³

The most ordinary, prosaic facts of life, their refraction through the prism of the consciousness of workers and peasants repeatedly provided Lenin with valuable evidence on the basis of which he made broad and far-reaching political generalizations. Attaching as he did fundamental importance to the everyday interests of ordinary people, to their moods, experience and outlook on things Lenin always insisted on the need for Party members to be in the very thick of the masses, to keep in constant touch with the masses, to keep their hands on the pulse

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of it in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 391.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Terms of Admission into the Communist International", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 207.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 296.

of their moods and attitudes to any issue at all times if they were to know exactly what the masses wanted and which way their minds were working, etc., in other words, all that is generally described as "ordinary consciousness".

The foregoing, we think, provides sufficient evidence showing that it is wrong to reduce "ordinary consciousness" to something negative and limited, since this consciousness faithfully reflects the masses' own experience and contains a good deal of common sense, practical conclusions and generalizations, which, it is true, do not constitute any systematic scientific or theoretical knowledge.

Under developed socialism the very way of life and everyday practice of members of socialist society help them gain a perception of their socialist social interests, to see and feel themselves as the true masters of the country. In this way, the "ordinary consciousness" of members of a fully developed socialist society becomes enriched. Hence, the importance of the ability to relate high-minded, lofty ideals to the everyday, mundane needs and interests of the community. At every stage of the revolutionary struggle and socialist construction the forms of this relationship changed and underwent improvement to fit the specific tasks faced by society at every juncture, the existing socio-economic environment, the rising cultural and educational standards of working people and the social experience they gained.

4. The Character of Ideology and Types of Propaganda

The character of ideology directly determines the type of propaganda. This dependence may be defined as follows: *the content of ideology—the functions of propaganda—methods and organization*. It is this direct, straightforward dependence of the type of propaganda on the nature of ideology that has produced a situation where in today's world the two main polarized ideologies are matched by two diametrically opposed types of propaganda—socialist and bourgeois. This fact is given real meaning in the context of the two ideologies involved which develop matching concepts of propaganda. This fact is now the

object of sociological and socio-psychological research called upon to equip the given ideological system with the most effective propaganda techniques and methods.

The crisis of the concept of "de-ideologization", until recently so much in vogue in the West, is highly symptomatic. By erecting an insurmountable barrier between ideology and propaganda, on the one hand, and science and information, on the other, by regarding ideologization as supposedly the absolute antithesis of the scientific approach, and seeing propaganda as the antithesis of information, this concept is aimed at convincing public opinion that in the age of the scientific revolution, in a situation dominated by a rapidly growing objective need for rationalizing every sphere of human life, by the increasing invasion by science of just about every area of social life, ideology is inevitably on the way out.

As expected, no sooner had it made its appearance the "de-ideologization" concept found itself in conflict with reality, which indicated the growing importance of ideology in modern society. More and more Western sociologists admit that it is impossible in a capitalist society to develop a theoretical position that would be accepted by all, that would be free of any class bias and that would equally meet the needs and aspirations of the various sections and groups of society. The recognition of this fact leads bourgeois sociologists to conclude that in society, generally speaking, only the means, "social technology", can be rationalized, but not the aims and certainly not the initial fundamental attitudes and principles of human behaviour. This conclusion is now behind the demands made by some bourgeois theorists to "re-ideologize" society. Their hopes for the appearance of an ideology-free society, one in which all relations and goals would be outside the realm of ideology, have failed to materialize. That this is so has been admitted by many non-Marxist sociologists in the West. Similar admissions about the significance of ideology in the functioning of social structures are made by many Western philosophers and sociologists. This is a characteristic symptom of the passage of Western philosophy and sociology from the "de-ideologization" of the 1960s to the "re-ideologization" of the 1970s. Raymond Aron, one of the architects of the "de-ideologization" concept, wrote in 1973 that the discussion "of the end of

ideologies is drawing to an end and a new ideological age is dawning".¹

As they encounter events and phenomena which indicate that the impact of ideological structures and factors on the behaviour of men in today's world, far from diminishing, is increasing as more and more people become involved in the process of making history, many Western sociologists are now seeking to reduce the essence of the problem to its technological explanation, to the spectacular proliferation of the new methods and instruments available to the mass media.

Admittedly, television, radio and the press are creating new opportunities and a new situation for ideology and propaganda. Each of the mass media has its own peculiarities and special advantages: the press ensures long-term storage of information, the radio—rapid diffusion of information, television—the unity of word and picture, the "watch-as-it-happens" effect and the possibility of transmitting events in physical motion. These advantages are so attractive as to merit the closest attention and examination.

However, for all the breath-taking possibilities offered by technological progress in the field of the mass media, the question of the essence and content of the ideological aspect of the life of modern society, the character and impact of ideology and propaganda on the minds and behaviour of men lies in the socio-economic and political-ideological areas rather than in the technological one. What is more, it is precisely the undue preoccupation of Western sociologists with the technological aspects of the problem that is the best evidence of the internal limitations which the content of bourgeois ideology, its class nature and thrust impose on the very method used by this ideology to influence the public mind.

The demands to "re-ideologize" bourgeois ideology do not remove the antinomy between ideology and science which is characteristic of bourgeois sociology. Within the framework of the proposed "re-ideologization" science and ideology have but a semblance of coexistence, they "complement" and mutually limit each other. The intensity of

¹ R. Aron, "Remarques sur le nouvel âge idéologique", *Contrepoint*, Paris, 1973, N 9, p. 13.

the ideological confrontation over the very formulation of the given problem reflects the real contradictions and trends in the formation of the spiritual-practical attitudes and values of human activity, especially in the character of relationships between theory and practice at the present stage of mankind's social and cultural history.

Unlike technocrats, the Marxists see the growing role of ideology above all in the socio-economic and political factors, in the growing need for a theoretical perception of class interests, of the objective position of particular social groups, their goals, tasks and behaviour, new situations and trends within the working class and the progressive forces of our time.

The record of the ideological practice to date indicates the existence of two polarized concepts of propaganda. This diametrical opposition is in evidence all along the line both in terms of content and in terms of the functional roles of the forms and methods used. The basic point of difference on which all the rest are dependent lies in the fact that *the Marxist concept of propaganda sees its main aim in developing the consciousness of the masses while the bourgeois concept believes in manipulating the public mind*. Manipulating in this instance is a form of social control over the mind and behaviour of the individual on the basis of creating distorted, biased ideas of reality, by insulating individual consciousness from social reality. The American sociologist Herbert Schiller admits in his *The Mind Managers* that: "...The aim of television and radio programming and films in a commercial society is not to arouse but to lessen concern about social and economic realities."¹

For all the shades of difference in the views of propaganda held by bourgeois sociologists, for all the plethora of definitions of propaganda in non-Marxist literature, they all have two basic points in common: 1) All define propaganda as a manipulatory activity, 2) All attempt to examine propaganda outside the concrete social context, outside its class content and class tasks which determine the typology of propaganda.

Thus, a highly characteristic definition of propaganda among bourgeois theoreticians is one whereby it is the

¹ H. Schiller, *The Mind Managers*, Boston, 1973, p. 31.

"art of making people do what they would not do if they were in possession of all the facts in a situation".¹ This view of propaganda is shared by such Western sociologists and political scientists as Harold Lesswell, Michael Choukas, and Robert Merton. Clearly this interpretation is based on a desire to separate and place in opposition the function of propaganda and the function of information.

US sociologist James Warburg in his *Unwritten Treaty* writes: "The function of an information agency is to disseminate truth—to make available fact and opinion, each carefully labelled and separated from the other. The aim of an information agency is to enable as many people as possible to form their own individual judgements on the basis of relevant fact and authoritative opinion."

"The function of a propaganda agency is almost the exact opposite: it is not to inform, but to persuade. In order to persuade it must disseminate only such fact, such opinion, and such fiction masquerading as fact as will serve to make people act, or fail to act, in the desired way."

"To think that these purposes are one and the same, or even similar, is a dangerous error."²

Characteristically, bourgeois concepts of propaganda are separated from other forms of social activity not only as regards the goals to be achieved but also as regards the methods to be employed. Western sociologists have been focusing on the methods and techniques of propaganda. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the bourgeois sociology of propaganda is nine-tenths an analysis of its technology as a manipulatory activity. Indeed Laswell makes this admission: "Not the purpose but the method distinguishes propaganda from the management of men by violence, boycott, bribery, and similar means of social control. Propaganda relies on symbols to attain its end; the manipulation of collective attitudes."³

In their view of propaganda as a manipulation on the mind Western sociologists are careful to bypass the question of the social character of propaganda, of its ideological origin and interests, and instead attempt to portray

¹ M. Choukas, *Propaganda Comes of Age*, Washington, 1965, p. 36.

² J. P. Warburg, *Unwritten Treaty*, New York, 1946, p. 18.

³ Quote from: M. Choukas, *Propaganda Comes of Age*, p. 14.

propaganda as a kind of formal mechanism within which any and all ideas irrespective of their message and content are free to circulate. This approach to propaganda hides not only the reluctance of Western sociologists to analyze specific relationships already existing between a particular type of ideology and a matching type of propaganda, but also their desire to achieve a certain ideological effect—to foster an attitude to propaganda as something negative irrespective of its content, to inculcate an idea in the public mind that lies and slander are by no means the prerogative of the bourgeois propaganda machine but are in fact "natural" qualities of any propaganda.

The bourgeois concepts of propaganda ignore the question of the relationships between ideas and reality, i.e., the question of objective truth is thrown out of the propaganda sphere as something that has no direct bearing in this department of social activity. As the US propaganda expert R. S. Lambert put it, the important thing is not whether what your propaganda says is in agreement with reality but rather whether you succeed in getting those you want to influence to believe your propaganda and act accordingly.¹

This refusal to analyze the content of propaganda is perhaps the most characteristic feature of the bourgeois sociology of propaganda. At the same time the Western theoreticians of propaganda give close attention to the pragmatic side of propaganda, the practical aspects of their propaganda efforts. This does not mean of course, that Western ideologists do not concern themselves with the content of propaganda at all. Thus, the US sociologist Herbert Schiller in his *The Mind Managers* gives a list of five basic myths which the mass media introduce into the public mind: 1) The myth of individualism and personal choice; 2) The myth of neutrality of all key social institutions; 3) The myth of unchanging human nature; 4) myth of the absence of class conflict in modern capitalist society; and 5) The myth of media pluralism.²

The processes associated with the growing role of ideological factors have received a peculiar interpretation on

¹ R. S. Lambert, *Propaganda*, New York, 1938.

² H. Schiller, *The Mind Managers*, pp. 8-24.

the part of the managers of modern capitalism. As state monopoly trends gather momentum in all basic areas of capitalist society, the ruling class is increasingly inclined to accept the idea that propaganda can no longer be left to the amateurs. Michael Choukas writes: "The practice of propaganda could not long remain at a pre-scientific stage, the artistic stage, while the areas which generated these modern conflicts, the economic, the political, and others, were being reconstructed more and more along scientific lines. Sooner or later propaganda too would have to be pulled into the orbit of science's rising star."¹ This is attributable not only to socio-political considerations but also to the greatly increased financial outlays made by the bourgeois state and monopolies for propaganda purposes.

It is from the angle of this narrowly pragmatic approach to the analysis of the propaganda mechanism that one should regard the thesis of modern bourgeois ideology on converting propaganda from an art form to a form of scientific activity. Choukas writes: "Modern propaganda... is strongly rooted in the scientific soil of our time, and any future growth is contingent upon the cultivation of that soil."² Now what is meant by "the future growth" being contingent upon the cultivation of the scientific soil? How do Western theoreticians see the meaning and content of propaganda as a science? And what is the significance of propaganda mastering a scientific approach to reality?

Whereas in the past, Choukas explains, propaganda has gravitated to a greater or lesser degree to the methods originally introduced by the enlighteners and was for the most part amateurish in character, in the modern world "...a departure from the old promotional activities takes place. For truth is no longer spread in order to inform. In fact, the principle itself of 'adjustment through enlightenment' is now inapplicable. The need now is not to inform people, but to *manipulate them*. To meet that need a new principle arises: successful manipulation must be achieved through *illusion*. To create that illusion, new methods and new

procedures are devised, and a new type of promotion—propagandistic—appears."¹

The reconstruction of bourgeois propaganda "along scientific lines", as Western sociologists phrase it, boils down to the following:

1) the effectiveness of propaganda efforts is contingent on how far and how well the propagandist has succeeded in gaining control over the behaviour of people. This effectiveness is the greater the less obvious is the control;

2) the planning and carrying out of propaganda measures must rely on "a strictly objective scientific basis" with the propagandist remaining a perfectly unbiased observer;

3) any propaganda activity must be preceded by a careful study and analysis of the psychological and social characteristics of the social group to be manipulated since the success of a propaganda exercise is largely dependent on how well it has been prepared.

The Western sociologists and political scientists never tire of emphasizing the need for developing new methods, procedures and techniques of propaganda activity on the basis of the latest findings in social psychology and other fields of science.

The current process whereby bourgeois propaganda is being dressed in "scientific robes" requires a precise evaluation. The efforts to gear the evidence of concrete sociological, psychological and physiological research to the needs of bourgeois propaganda do not mean that this propaganda has become more objective. "Scientific" recommendations are being used by Western propagandists not to achieve closer correspondence between the content of their propaganda and reality, not to give it a more profound theoretical content, but rather to create all manner of illusions, fictionalized views of the real world, to disseminate them and introduce them into the public mind. Bourgeois propaganda while it has failed to become more scientific has indeed become more subtle and sophisticated, for it has been concentrating on improving the technology of its giant machine, on manufacturing more and cheaper spiritual

¹ M. Choukas, *Propaganda Comes of Age*, p. 79.

² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹ *Ibid.* p. 74.

narcotics—illusions, beliefs, etc., on identifying the more vulnerable points in human psychology, on fostering mass prejudices.

Present-day bourgeois literature on the subject devotes a lot of space to the socio-psychological aspects of propaganda. One of the salient features of bourgeois propaganda today is its "psychologization", its striving to influence not so much the mind as the emotions of the individual, to influence the subconscious, its exploitation of traditional, vulgar stereotypes, and all sorts of philistine sentiments and prejudices. This does not mean, however, that the ideological impact is completely ousted by the psychological one. Bourgeois propaganda is today every bit as ideological as thirty, fifty or even a hundred years ago. For all that, however, there have been a number of notable shifts affecting the structure of bourgeois propaganda as well as its content and ideological principles. These processes are of interest because they enable one to see the essential connection between the evolution of the ideological content of propaganda and the forms and methods of propaganda activity.

Early bourgeois ideology born as it was of the first bourgeois revolutions was a progressive and optimistic ideology which called on the masses to rise up against the oppression of feudal lords and the Church under the slogans of liberty, equality and brotherhood. Early bourgeois ideologists appealed to the minds and civic sentiments of their audiences. "Propaganda through enlightenment" was a potent weapon in their hands. However, after the establishment of capitalism, bourgeois ideology lost its progressive character. One of its favourite heroes now is the consumer, the target of its activity as it develops new slogans and appeals. Today bourgeois propaganda aims not to convince or persuade, but to tempt and lure.

What has actually occurred has nothing to do with any "de-politization" or "de-ideologization" of bourgeois propaganda, but everything to do with a change in the forms and methods of propaganda, exemplified in propaganda techniques borrowed from the advertising industry's psychological brain-washing of the consumer which results in the latter being quite unable to

make a conscious, independent choice. At the same time bourgeois propaganda is increasingly exhibiting a desire to subjugate, in one way or another, all other spheres and mechanisms that actively influence the minds and psychology of men. There are unmistakable signs of the increasing ideologization of advertising in the capitalist countries. Advertising in modern capitalist society apart from its conventional functions of promoting particular goods and services including the stimulation of "new" needs, and creation of "artificial" demand, is increasingly tackling a clearly ideological "supertask" to get the consumer to see his world as the best of all possible worlds.

The employment by bourgeois propagandists of psychological and technological methods, their concentration on generating consumer, philistine attitudes, all manner of prejudices, on stimulating stereotypes in reacting to life, on cultivating distorted forms of consciousness through political demagogy are, above all, signs of deepening ideological crisis ravaging capitalism, signs of its progressive spiritual impoverishment. However, the crisis of bourgeois ideology does not mean that it has lost its instrumental significance in the hands of the ruling class. The absence of an overall positive ideological programme, the lack of ideals capable of inspiring and rallying the nation together are offset by bourgeois propaganda by recourse to other means. The fact is that the impact and spread of ideological concepts depend not only on their content but also on how powerful and far-flung is the network of propaganda agencies and media capable of spreading particular ideas, of exploiting existing prejudices, of making capital out of real problems.

The exploitative possibilities of today's bourgeois propaganda cannot be regarded in isolation from the overall measures taken by state monopoly capitalism to step up and make more subtle its socio-political manoeuvring with a view to mitigating the more acute of the numerous internal contradictions and taking the edge off crisis situations by relying on the latest achievements of science and engineering. The increasing intervention of state monopoly capitalism in matters of propaganda is a salient feature of the present stage in

the evolution of bourgeois propaganda. "It follows that all propaganda activities should be placed exclusively in the hands of those responsible for the safety of the state, namely the government."¹ The propaganda machine is steadily becoming more centralized with the bourgeois state taking a more direct and active part in running it. In late 1977 all propaganda agencies in the US dealing with aspects of foreign policy were brought together under the umbrella of the State Department.

Propaganda activities are becoming more specialized and professionalized as new professions come into being, e.g., "moral operations officers", "propaganda analysts". Different propaganda agencies coalesce with special services, a process very much in evidence in the case of propaganda agencies concerned with foreign policy, and, above, all, with elements of the intelligence community. Choukas writes: "Whether in war or peace today every large-scale propaganda operation finds the propagandists literally surrounded by 'intelligence' desks staffed with such experts whose sole function is to feed the propagandists with the most accurate and latest information available on the target group under consideration."²

Once in the hands of the governing class the "manufacturing" of mass consciousness acquires an impressive economic, scientific and technological potential: propaganda agencies can draw on the entire resources of the bourgeois state and are supported by political actions, including those of a repressive nature. It would be wrong to underestimate the regulatory impact of state monopoly capitalism on the sphere of social consciousness, to underestimate the possibility of the state and capitalist corporations exercising effective control over intellectual and cultural life of a nation through concentrating and centralizing the mass media and through a more rigorous selection in the market of bourgeois ideas.

Within the framework of the manipulatory approach to propaganda, as the record to date shows, there are good opportunities for total brain-washing of the masses

and for introducing into the daily lives of the people the desired model of human behaviour. In particular, one should bear in mind certain peculiarities of public psychology, notably the relative ease with which people get accustomed to false political judgements which may eventually seem to the people holding them as unquestionable axioms and thus affect other areas of their consciousness. When brain-washed in advance men may even accept absurd, nonsensical ideological actions and make conclusions on the basis of falsified facts which fit in with the traditional mode of thought which is what the given propaganda exercise has been designed to achieve.

An important source of the functional effectiveness of propaganda at the manipulative level is the "inertness" of undeveloped consciousness. "The tradition of all the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living,"¹ this description of the spiritual life of a capitalist society provided by Marx last century has retained its relevance to this day. Bourgeois propaganda has always exploited everything that is dead, or moribund in an attempt to preserve prejudices and illusions which are spontaneously generated by the capitalist way of life. Today bourgeois propaganda, no longer content with just preserving prejudices that have arisen spontaneously, is deliberately introducing into the public mind using a powerful mass media machine desired stereotypes of attitudes and behaviour which are designed to complement the already existing arsenal of prejudices that arise spontaneously.

Finally, we should point to yet another factor in the context of the possibilities of manipulatory propaganda. Neither the quantity of mass media means, nor the advanced technology of manipulation, nor the existence of certain traditions and prejudices can of themselves explain adequately the specific features of the impact of bourgeois ideology. Of decisive importance in the final analysis is the mystified character of the social relations in bourgeois society, the specific features

¹ M. Choukas, *Propaganda Comes of Age*, p. 282.

² *Ibid.*, p. 86-87.

¹ K. Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 1, p. 398.

of the power of capital which spontaneously camouflages the actual relationships of master and slave, the antagonism between classes and which confronts consciousness with a semblance of equality and equivalence as a kind of universal principle of realizing human relations under capitalism.

The concentration of bourgeois propaganda on the manipulatory effect of its activities is attributable to profound social causes. This emphasis springs from conservative, safeguarding functions of modern bourgeois ideology whose class role and function is primarily to preserve and consolidate the social system that has had its day historically. It is precisely under such conditions that a real gap arises between objective historical requirements of the development of the consciousness of the masses—the vehicles of social progress—and the aims of mind management within the given social system. This gap can be “closed” by the governing class only by abandoning scientific investigation of social processes in favour of illusory ideological constructions, only at the price of foregoing objective information in favour of misinformation, through a refusal to adopt a policy aimed at moulding a conscious, active attitude of the masses to social reality in favour of manipulating the minds and behaviour of people. The existing antithesis between science and ideology, information and propaganda, self-rule and manipulation of consciousness indicate that the social organism is in crisis, a crisis that impedes further social progress. This antithesis is not an eternal, “natural” quality of the spiritual life of society. It can and already is being overcome under a different socioeconomic system, a different ideological system and a different conceptual attitude to the development of man’s spiritual potential—in the socialist part of the world.

The way of going beyond the strictly manipulative ideological influence on human consciousness has been pointed out by the Marxist concept of propaganda, by the socialist practice in shaping the ideological life of society. In raising the question of conditions ensuring the maximum effect on the public mind, the manipulative concept of propaganda in the final count reduces

it to an analysis of the formal elements of the “transference” of political principles and attitudes, ideological images, propaganda slogans and behavioural imperatives from the subject to the object of propaganda.

An essential feature of the Marxist-Leninist concept of propaganda which springs from its fundamental socio-political and philosophical-theoretical premises is the fact that it does not make a fetish out of the technology, out of this “transference” and pushes to the fore the objective truthfulness of the ideas being disseminated through the channels of propaganda. It is the truthful nature of an ideological system that eventually guarantees the strength and long-lasting effect of its impact on the minds.

The fundamental principles of the Marxist-Leninist concept of propaganda are determined by the real interests of socialist society, by the prospects of its further development, by its “openness” to the future. The significance of propaganda as an instrument for developing human consciousness, for stimulating an active attitude to social reality, far from diminishing as the socialist society becomes more mature, is increasing as the complexity and scale of tasks in building communist society grow. That this is so is becoming clear at the present stage in the evolution of the USSR’s socialist society when the level of consciousness, scientific knowledge, the rising standards of efficiency in production and in social life are coming to influence more and more the progress of the country’s productive forces and the progressive evolution and harmonization of social relations.

The manipulatory essence of bourgeois propaganda is countered by the Marxist-Leninist Party with the political education of the masses aimed at turning them into conscious and active makers of history. This is the prime goal of socialist propaganda. As Lenin put it: “The worker’s party places all its hopes in the masses . . . who are politically conscious, demanding and militant.”¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Attitude of the Bourgeois Parties and of the Workers’ Party to the Duma Elections”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 416.

The consciousness of the masses is an essential factor of historical progress. Which path history takes, the speed and concrete form of the construction of social society are largely dependent on the degree and level of that consciousness. Hence the fundamental importance of propaganda as an instrument of political education of the masses who should know all and act consciously, and an instrument of consolidating the masses and stimulating their sense of class identity and organization.

Socialist propaganda is propaganda by truth. Lenin wrote: "Clarity in propaganda and agitation is a fundamental condition. When our enemies said and admitted that we had performed miracles in developing agitation and propaganda, that was not to be understood in the superficial sense that we had large numbers of agitators and used up large quantities of paper, but in the intrinsic sense that the truth contained in that propaganda penetrated to the minds of all; there is no escaping from that truth."¹

Thus, propaganda may be understood in the "superficial" sense and in the "intrinsic" sense. The Marxist concept of propaganda in the "intrinsic" sense is a rationalist concept in that it accords primacy to the substantive aspect of the thing, since the aim of propaganda is to develop the consciousness of the masses.

Being a rationalist concept both in terms of content (the dissemination of scientific ideology) and in terms of its tasks (political education of the masses) and methods (persuasion) the Marxist concept of propaganda by no means ignores the socio-psychological side, the active role of emotions and sentiments in the popular imagination and perception of things. At the same time the exploration of the psychological mechanisms involved and of the way they work can only be conducted on the basis of a clear understanding of the specific social content and type of propaganda in the class sense.

The study of social and psychological problems from the standpoint of the needs and demands of socialist ideological practice is by no means confined to an "aca-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 457.

ademic" analysis which merely states and describes different levels of consciousness. On the contrary, the classical examples of the Marxist analysis of consciousness and psychology provided by Lenin are inseparable from the practical solution of the most acute problems whose resolution was often crucial to the future of the revolution and later to the survival of the young Soviet Republic and the prospects of socialist construction.

The Marxist-Leninist approach to the emotional factors has always been noted for its strictly political realism. Any artificial working up of emotions, let alone playing on the sentiments or instincts, is alien to an ideology with a scientific content and rational meaning. Lenin emphasized that one had to develop an ability to identify exactly without any false idealization the degree of consciousness exhibited by a particular class, social stratum or group, the degree of their readiness to accept particular slogans, an ability to identify the strength of their prejudices, illusions and misconceptions. Realism in politics is inseparable from realism in ideology and from honesty in propaganda.

Lenin has provided shining examples of a specific concrete analysis of the level of consciousness exhibited by different contingents of the working class when he was directing preparations for the socialist revolution in Russia, examples of the analysis of the contradictions in the minds of the working peasantry on the eve of the New Economic Policy and of the analysis of the specific features of the social psychology of the intelligentsia. Lenin kept these questions within his field of vision, under his constant review, giving them particularly close attention when the situation was taking abrupt turns, when it was necessary to advance new slogans and battle cries. Suffice it to point to such classical examples as the background to the advancing of the slogans: All Power to the Soviets!, The Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!, We Should Learn to Trade!, Master the Science of Communism!

When the Party advanced Lenin's slogans Our First Task is to Study, Our Second Task is to Study and Our Third Task is to Study!, We Should Learn to Trade! even a proportion of the Communist and Komsomol membership were not psychologically ready to accept

them for it was no easy matter to switch psychologically away from "the Red-Guard attack" on capital and the open class confrontation on the battlefronts of the Civil War. Lenin and the Communist Party he led were fully aware of the complexity of the social and psychological readjustment that was taking place in the people's minds brought about by the country's passage to a period of peaceful construction and to the new tasks arising before it that called for new methods of work and new approaches. With great persistence and consistence they patiently explained the substance and meaning of the new slogans, proved the need for them and, above all, for their implementation.

When Lenin was advancing the demand for an ability to determine without any false idealization the mood of the masses he was fully aware that even a proportion of the working class in the period of the proletarian dictatorship was by no means insured against passivity and apathy towards social questions, against a quick change of mood, to speak nothing of the heavy burden of prejudice that was still dominant in the petty-bourgeois milieu. But as Lenin repeatedly pointed out, what distinguished Marxism from utopian socialism was that the latter proposed to build a new society using the willing co-operation of particularly virtuous people cultivated in special human hothouses and not drawing on the imperfect human material available, the product of a bloody, dirty, predatory, shop-keeper's capital.

Socialist propaganda has to deal with not only the "light", "pleasant" aspects of consciousness but also with its less attractive, "seamy" sides including all manner of prejudices. Whereas the task of bourgeois propaganda is to preserve these prejudices, socialist propaganda has to tackle a far more difficult task, that of overcoming them. In Soviet Russia the process of overcoming prejudices in the public mind moved not only in the direction of Marxist political education and education generally, raising cultural and educational standards of the masses, but primarily in the direction of involving the masses in active social and political activities, in the building of a new way of life in town and country.

The Marxist concept of propaganda which aims at the political enlightenment and organization of the masses, at developing their political awareness, quite logically emphasizes the clarity of its ideological content and message, the scientific nature of its slogans and appeals. The psycho-technical problems, for all their importance for the practical organization of propaganda activity, have always been relegated to second place in the Marxist concept of propaganda. Research into psychological and technical problems of propaganda and the practical application of specific findings and recommendations resulting from this research is aimed above all at facilitating a fuller assimilation by the target audience of propaganda, of its substantive aspects, at making its message crystal clear and its ideological content more scientific.

What the propagandist formulates as the problem of the relevance of lofty ideals to the daily interests of men, as the interconnection between theoretical and "practical" consciousness, forms part of a larger problem, that concerning the relationship between ideology and social psychology as a whole.

Social psychology, unlike ideology as the theoretical form of social consciousness, is characterized by a greater degree of heterogeneity and structural diversity including the rational and emotional, the conscious and the unconscious. There is a school of thought maintaining that the movement of emotions and moods is less subject to a purposeful management on the part of the ruling class since this movement is not amenable to rigid control and regimentation. We believe that this is a debatable proposition.

For it is precisely social psychology which, unlike ideology, is more mobile and responsive and is thus a far more pliable and rewarding target for external influence, for inherent in it is a sufficiently unstable world of emotions, changing moods, rapid switches from one mood to another and back, all of which is a frequent enough phenomenon, notably in the petty-bourgeois environment. Fluctuations of mood, their instability and volatile nature have always been exploited by the bourgeoisie in an attempt to influence mass consciousness ideologically. Prejudices and misconcep-

tions, social apathy have been constantly stimulated and maintained in an exploiting society and used by the powers that be for reactionary political purposes.

The Marxist concept of propaganda which attaches first importance to its substantive aspects proceeds from the recognition of the importance of persuasion as the basic tool of propaganda activities, for what is involved is the assimilation by the target audience of the scientific content of the ideas, knowledge and ideals being promoted and propagandized. Therefore, of crucial importance for the Marxist concept of propaganda is to gain a clear understanding of the mechanism of persuasion which is developed at the juncture of three disciplines—ideology, social psychology and pedagogics.

Political education is inseparable from cultural and enlightening activities, from the work of raising the cultural and educational standards of the masses and in this sense it includes pedagogics. Lenin held that the Party's political activities would always contain an element of pedagogics. But at the same time he was careful to emphasize that politics and pedagogics were not to be mixed any more than higher and primary knowledge could be mixed together. In politics the pedagogical element always has a secondary role to play. Of decisive importance for educational activities in a socialist society are socio-political and ideological factors which can be classified into the following basic groups:

- clear, well-defined class positions and consequently, consistency and adherence to principles in any evaluation of historical events and current social developments;

- to practice what one preaches. This is what Lenin called "sincerity in politics";

- the relevance of the principles and slogans advanced to the existing economic, living and working conditions of men. Propaganda divorced from the realities of daily life, and this divorce is characteristic of subjectivism in ideological activities, even if it may inspire the masses for a brief period, will inevitably result in an anti-climax and disenchantment for years afterwards;

- a clear line of distinction in propaganda between what has been done and what is still to be done, the inadmissibility of equating "what is" with "what should be". This is what Lenin described as the "revolutionary dialectics of Marxist realism";

- a realistic assessment of the actual level of the consciousness, culture and self-discipline, of the impact of particular prejudices and anti-social phenomena on different sections of the population;

- not just a statement of existing problems and difficulties but also exposure of their causes both objective and subjective. It is important to show how problems and shortcomings are being overcome in real life and what is being done to eliminate negative phenomena. To educate the masses by means of positive example.

The realism of propaganda lies not in empiricism, nor in its down-to-earthness but rather in a real living relevance of lofty ideals to the actual everyday interests of men, to their actual living and working conditions, their moods and sentiments. The former without the latter degenerates into phrase-mongering, the latter without the former—into a form of primitivism. Marx wrote that it was important to present an idea to the masses "...from a tough, real standpoint derived from the immediate environment".¹

¹ K. Marx, "Proceedings of the Sixth Rhine Province Assembly Debates on Freedom of the Press". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 172.

SCIENTIFIC IDEOLOGY IN A DEVELOPED SOCIALIST SOCIETY

1. The New Conditions of Ideological Activity

Every new major change in social development together with new socio-economic and political tasks and international problems brought with it new tasks in the field of socialist ideology and education, agitation and propaganda. This is a perfectly logical development. Ideological work is an essentially creative, target-oriented activity which is unthinkable without a constant effort to take into account every change occurring in the country's economy, science and engineering, education, culture, and international relations. For their part, spiritual factors are increasingly becoming instrumental in accelerating social progress while the growing role of consciousness and organization among the masses is becoming a natural law of the evolving communist formation. In the words of the Programme of the CPSU: "In the struggle for the victory of communism, ideological work becomes an increasingly powerful factor. The higher the social consciousness of the members of society, the more fully and broadly their creative activities come into play in the building of the material and technical basis of communism, in the development of communist forms of labour and new relations between people, and, consequently, the more rapidly and successfully the building of communism proceeds."¹

¹ *The Road to Communism. Documents of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, October 17-31, 1961, Moscow, 1962, p. 563.*

The CPSU has consistently been guided by this principle of its programme. It is a basic Leninist tradition of the CPSU to give close attention to the problems of education, ideology and ideological work. This attention springs from the fundamental principle of life in a socialist society which is that the strength of the socialist system lies in the consciousness and conscientiousness of the masses. The great goal of building communism would be unattainable without the full and balanced development of man himself.¹ In stating this the CPSU emphasized the full importance of ideological activity. No matter what problems it may be tackling, whether those relating to foreign policy, economic activity, social development, the nationalities question, culture or education, the Party has invariably drawn on the tremendous spiritual potential inherent in the socialist social system, in its ideology, mores, morality and way of life.

The content of ideological activity and its special character are determined, on the one hand, by the unique parameters of a particular historical stage in the evolution of society and, on the other, by long-term goals.

The Marxists have always looked upon socialism not as a ready-made system which can be put together overnight but rather as a dynamically evolving society passing through a series of successive stages of development. In the original version of his article "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" Lenin pointed out that "in a developed socialist society..."² the approach to specific economic, social and educational problems would be different from what it was at the time of writing. Therefore he believed it to be a matter of paramount importance to identify with sufficient scientific precision the distinctive features and qualitative characteristics of each given stage of social development. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that such a theoretical analysis formed the scientific basis of practical

¹ See *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 87.

² V. I. Lenin, "Original Version of the Article 'The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government'", *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 78.

activity in every area of public life and that the Communist Party should tailor its policy to fit the requirements of each successive stage of the economic maturity of socialism.

At the present stage the CPSU has drawn a fundamental theoretical and political conclusion to the effect that in the USSR thanks to the self-sacrificing efforts of the Soviet people a fully developed socialist society has been built. The historical place of developed socialism, its characteristic features and ways of maturing into communism have been defined and written into the new Soviet Constitution. It is precisely from the standpoint of developed socialism as a qualitatively new stage in the evolution of the communist formation that the CPSU has been creatively and purposefully developing the full range of economic, social and ideological problems relating to the solution of both current and long-term tasks. The materials of the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU, the decisions of the CC CPSU, the reports, articles and public statements of Leonid Brezhnev and other Soviet leaders contain a full-scale ideological concept which is adequate to the social conditions of a fully developed socialist society.

Questions of ideology and political and educational work are being examined by the CPSU in the light of the far-reaching changes that have occurred in the life and social consciousness of the Soviet people under developed socialism, and from the standpoint of the tasks that the Party is tackling today and will have to tackle tomorrow. The assessments and conclusions made by the CPSU regarding the character of the present stage in the country's social and economic progress point to a promising and fruitful way towards multi-dimensional approach to ideological work.

A fully developed socialist society, in the words of the new Soviet Constitution is "... a society of high organisational capacity, ideological commitment, and consciousness of the working people, who are patriots and internationalists". Ideological factors have a constructive role to play in every area of life in the USSR.

As the scale of communist construction expands, the ideological aspects of rapidly developing social processes are becoming ever more important. The spectacular

progress of science and engineering, rapid changes in socio-economic relations, the steady improvement of living and working conditions and of material welfare, the rising cultural and educational standards, the growing level of consciousness and awareness of the people, through being better informed on events at home and abroad, the arrival of new generations—all this is influencing the sphere of ideology, confronting it with new tasks and problems whose solution calls for an imaginative approach.

It is of paramount importance to take full account of all these rapid changes if ideological activity is to become more effective in all areas and sectors of national life. To evaluate the results achieved soberly and objectively, to be able to generalize and disseminate positive experience, to be able to see not only the concerns of the day but also future prospects, to combat shortcomings and drawbacks without compromise, to be self-critical—these are some of the main tasks the Soviet Communists set themselves in every field of ideological work.

A fully developed socialist society creates favourable conditions for ideological activity. These include, apart from an advanced stage of development of the country's material and technical basis, a high degree of maturity of socialist social relations, social homogeneity of society, also the greatly increased socio-political experience of the people which has been substantially added to in recent years through the steady development of socialist democracy and the increasingly active participation of the masses in the running of society, matters of state, and working collectives.

The country-wide discussion of the new Soviet Constitution which involved for all intents and purposes the entire adult population of the USSR, was a good school of education for the masses. The free, wide-ranging and business-like discussion of the Draft of the Constitution of the USSR has demonstrated that everyone, every worker, collective farmer and intellectual feels himself a master of his country, a feeling that was originally born at the time of the October Revolution and was later solidified forever by the victory of socialism in the USSR.

Each new major step in expanding and deepening the social experiences of the masses signifies at the same time a new step forward in their ideological and political education. Therefore in ideological terms it is impossible to overestimate the wealth of experience which millions of Soviet people gained in the course of the preparations for and the celebration of the 60th Anniversary of the October Revolution and the country-wide discussion of the Draft of the Soviet Constitution. This covered all aspects of life in the USSR, all questions big and small affecting the daily lives of Soviet people. For sheer scale and depth of discussion and in the number of contributors to it this was an unprecedented phenomenon even in the history of Soviet socialist democracy.

A detailed review of the heroic record of the October Socialist Revolution coupled with the summing up of the record of achievements of the sixty-odd years of Soviet government and the constitutional formalization of the great triumphs of socialism in the USSR are of tremendous ideological and educational significance for they make Soviet people take pride in their socialist Homeland, foster the feeling of Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism and make every Soviet citizen show a greater sense of responsibility for the common cause of communist construction.

Educational work is the more successful the closer it integrates into a single educative effort all forms of ideological influence, the constantly growing social and political experience of the working people, the heavier the reliance of ideological and educational work as a whole on this experience.

The adoption of the new Soviet Constitution whose purpose is to give a new dimension to socialist democracy opens up great prospects in this work. Suffice it to point to the fundamental importance of the constitutional formalization of the role and significance of the working collective within the political system of socialist society, the constitutional definition of its rights, duties and tasks among which educational tasks figure prominently.

The broader and deeper Soviet democracy, the more diversified and richer the socio-political and production

experience of the masses, the more favourable are the conditions for intensifying the ideological influence on all social processes at work in Soviet society.

Together with their social experience the level of consciousness, organization and culture of Soviet people has grown immeasurably. These factors offer new and better opportunities for helping the masses to assimilate Marxist-Leninist ideology by relying on its essential scientific nature. The creation of a favourable socio-political climate for ideological activity does not imply that its content or character should be simplified, since its goals and tasks are becoming more diversified and more ambitious, the demands made on its forms and methods become more varied, while criteria and yardsticks of its effectiveness—more exacting.

A comprehensive, systems approach to the resolution of the burning social problems is a characteristic feature of a developed socialist society whether the area concerned is economics, scientific and technological progress, or social matters. A systems approach is standard in the Soviet Union's ideological and spiritual spheres. Current trends in the development of science and engineering, the principal trends in the evolution of social relations, all call for people with a full and balanced social, ideological, political, moral and professional development. These philosophical truths in a developed socialist society are vital needs, and further intensive progress of society is impossible unless they are fully met.

A comprehensive, systems approach to the various aspects of social life has been developed and applied by Leonid Brezhnev in his report to the 25th Congress of the CPSU in 1976. In this report matters relating to the development of the material and technical basis of communism, of improving social relations and developing the socialist way of life and the moulding of a new man form an integral organic component of the single process of communist construction.

The report of the CC CPSU to the 25th Congress contains a theoretical elaboration of such key problems of ideological activity as the unity of ideological and educational and organizational work, of concrete tasks and long-term goals of education. It emphasizes the

indissoluble link between patriotic and internationalist education and the unity of political, moral and labour education, socialist emulation as a fusion of political and labour education, correlation of material and spiritual values in the socialist way of life, and the essential unity of communist morality and ordinary standards of morality.

The new tasks facing the ideological workers include efforts to incorporate efficiently ideological factors in the solution of socio-economic and educational problems, to improve information services across the board, to make all forms of ideological activity more relevant to the real conditions of life, to make the message of ideological work crystal clear and backed up by effective arguments, to take more fully into account the actual educational, cultural standards and spiritual needs of the people, and to master the art of educating the masses politically, modelling themselves on Lenin's skill in the matter.

The statement and elaboration of these problems imply an intensification of the social role of ideology in the country's public life. The 25th Congress of the CPSU made greater effectiveness of the ideological work directly dependent on deepening its theoretical content, strengthening the link between it and the country's economic and cultural life, a purposeful, target-oriented employment of all available resources and methods, a substantive approach to the evaluation of ideological and propaganda operations when these are regarded from the standpoint of end results rather than the arithmetical sum total of the number of measures adopted.

The 25th Congress of the CPSU thoroughly examined, in the light of the current exigencies of ideological work, the problem of a comprehensive approach to the organization of educational activities. Today not only the demands being made on the human personality become more exacting but they have also become more varied and it is inadmissible to sacrifice even a single aspect of education. Therefore it is important to achieve a maximum concentration of all ideological efforts, to carry on the education of the masses on a broad front to be sure that it covers all basic spheres which mould human character and personality (places of

work, the family, rest and recreation, daily life in the broad sense). Naturally, it is precisely today that the question of the unity of all basic aspects of communist education—ideological, political, labour and moral—has acquired added urgency.

Soviet society disposes today of the biggest and most varied arsenal of instruments of education than at any time since 1917. New scientific and technological opportunities have become available and this calls for better co-ordination of all ideological means and for their more rational and effective employment. But one can only co-ordinate really effectively that which is strictly differentiated, which performs its specific tasks best. Therefore it is important to make full use of the specific advantages and opportunities offered by television, radio, the press, propaganda through lectures, and political education for the masses. In other words, common integrated tasks in education can be successfully tackled only through the optimal utilization of the specific advantages and functions of each of the available types of educative facilities. It is important to emphasize this requirement since a comprehensive solution to the problem of education by no means implies that one and all undertake "to handle all and everything" but rather that each propagandist and ideologist should show a high sense of responsibility for his particular job and concentrate on doing it well. This is another basic requirement of the comprehensive, systems approach to education.

A comprehensive approach to ideological activity presupposes a close connection with and mutual consideration of the various economic, scientific and technical, social and spiritual factors involved. Each of these factors has its own ideological consequences and affects the sphere of consciousness either directly or indirectly.

2. The Ideological Aspects of Economic Development

A developed socialist society exhibits more fully and clearly the intrinsic interconnection between socio-economic and ideological factors, between education and economic management. The scientific and technological revolution has opened up new vistas in ideological work.

The interconnection between science, engineering, and ideological activity can be rationally appreciated and understood through the prism of those demands which the scientific and technological revolution makes on the human personality, on the worker. The explosive progress of science and engineering, the conversion of science into a productive force in its own right, presuppose the existence at the human end of production of modern knowledge, a high level of professionalism and high cultural standards, great precision and speed of operations, all of which in turn require of the man on the job, moral reliability, a high sense of organization, responsibility, conscientiousness and close co-ordination among the operations performed by a team of workers. We are thus confronted with an intricate pattern of socio-economic, scientific-technological and human factors in production, all of which give a new dimension to the problem "man—production" from the ideological standpoint.

The Soviet philosophical literature of the mid-1960s often criticized the mistaken idea that the fruits of ideological work can be "weighed" on the same balance used for measuring the results of economic activities. This erroneous thesis oversimplified the complex inter-relationships between ideology and economic activity and gave a one-sided assessment to the effectiveness of ideological work. This controversy in philosophical literature lent a very relevant modern dimension to Lenin's criteria of ideological activity. The point of departure for an effective and fundamental solution of the problem is one of the cardinal principles of historical materialism in its interpretation of the social nature of man. Lenin wrote: "By what criteria are we to judge the *real* 'thoughts and feelings' of *real* individuals? Naturally, there can be only one such criterion—the *actions* of these individuals. And since we are dealing only with social 'thoughts and feelings', one should add: the *social actions* of individuals, i.e., *social facts*."¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 405.

In Lenin's view, then, the social actions of individuals, social facts are the objective criterion of ideological activity. Its results find concrete expression in the full diversity of events and phenomena of real life and above all in the degree of consciousness, organization and sense of responsibility of individuals, in their attitude to work and social property, in the cultural and organizational standards in places of work, in everyday life and rest and recreation, and also in what they do to improve efficiency at every sector of communist construction.

Ideological activity for all its importance cannot replace efforts to solve quite real socio-economic and scientific and technological problems. At the same time it looks at the full range of problems facing society from the standpoint of their impact on the consciousness, behaviour and psychology of members of society. Effective ideological work is unthinkable without a comprehensive examination of all changes occurring in the country's economy, science and engineering above all from the standpoint of their social impact on the daily lives of people, on their minds and psychology.

A basic index of the effectiveness of ideological activity is such a multi-dimensional social fact as the socio-political and moral climate that arises in society. The Soviet Communist Party, always aware of this, has attached prime importance to creating a favourable social climate seeing it as an essential condition of the unswerving adherence to the Leninist standards of Party life and principles of Party leadership.

Soviet Communists have subjected to principled criticism the violations of socialist legality which were committed during the Stalin cult of personality period and drew the necessary practical conclusions for the future. As Leonid Brezhnev emphasized in his speech at the 25th Congress of the CPSU: "In this context, the decisions of the 20th Congress whose twentieth anniversary now falls due, were highly important. A key role in strengthening and developing the Leninist rules and principles of Party life has been played by the decisions of the October 1964 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee and the 23rd and 24th Congresses of the Party. The consistent development of inner-Party democracy

and the growing demands being made on every member of the Party—these Leninist principles are not a thing of the past. This is the basis for the development of the Party of our day as well.”¹ It is evident, that the situation that has taken shape within the Party, the level of the development of inner-Party life largely determine the climate in Soviet society as a whole. We believe that this climate may be a faithful *general index* of the effectiveness of ideological activity as a whole. At the same time a healthy social, political and moral atmosphere prevailing in society guarantees the public's trust and faith in propaganda and in political education.

A good deal of fruitful work has been done over the past few years to study the effectiveness of ideological activity, simplistic views that were expounded in certain works have been overcome and new prospects of further research in the field have been outlined. At the same time we believe that the view whereby the effectiveness and success of ideological and educational work is to be measured exclusively by the degree of approximation of so-called “ordinary” consciousness and behaviour to scientific consciousness, is debatable and calls for further discussion.

On the basis of this general proposition the conclusion is sometimes drawn that “knowledge” is the most universal criterion of effectiveness for all types and means of ideological education; thus, for example, in the case of aesthetic education it is aesthetic knowledge, in the case of atheistic education—“a knowledge of the fundamentals of scientific atheism”; in the case of labour education—ideological conviction in the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the role of labour in human society, in the moulding of man, etc.

It seems that this approach which reduces the results of the ideological activity to knowledge, to factors of consciousness, springs from an underestimation of “practical consciousness” and thus reduces the essence of the problem to the mere pulling up of “ordinary” consciousness to the level of the scientific one.

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 78.

For all the importance of scientific knowledge the essence and results of education reside in practical actions.

The eminent Soviet scholar A. N. Leontyev wrote: “It is not enough to learn words, not enough to understand what they mean, and not even enough to understand the thoughts and feelings they convey. What is important is that these thoughts and feelings contribute to moulding the personality of the individual in question. This simple idea expresses the most important conclusion which is prompted by the living experience of educating human beings. Therefore this idea is embraced and understood by all those who, like Dobrolyubov, Ushinsky and Tolstoy, approach the school, education and upbringing generally, above all from the standpoint of what sort of man we want to have and not from the standpoint of just what skills, thoughts and feelings we would like to see in the individual.

“The difference between these two approaches is by no means juggling with words, its decisive importance has to be understood fully.” (Italics mine—N. B.)

The Marxist-Leninist concept of ideology has inherited and developed precisely this approach which relies on the living practice of education, the democratic traditions of classical pedagogical thought, and has applied this approach to the entire sphere of education. The basic yardstick of the success of communist education is represented by concrete actions, a constructive attitude to life on the part of the individual, and the unity between word and deed as a norm of daily behaviour.

Under developed socialism when more and more ideological resources of society are geared to the effort to solve social and economic problems, Lenin's ideas on the relevance of agitation and propaganda to the realities of economic construction have acquired special importance and topicality. It would be wrong on the basis of criticism of the oversimplistic understanding of the link between ideological activity and economic results, to conclude that the economic sphere, economic management and production are a secondary target for propaganda and agitation activities. Anyone who makes this conclusion rushes into other extreme and

violates the Leninist principle of interconnection between ideology and economics, between education and economic management.

After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution Lenin posed in a new way the question of the tasks of propaganda and political education to change their content in connection with the country's transition to peacetime economic construction. In his celebrated article entitled "A Great Beginning" Lenin emphasized: "... Another task comes to the forefront just as inevitably and ever more imperatively as time goes on, namely, the more important task of positive communist construction, the creation of new economic relations, of a new society."¹ Developing this idea Lenin wrote that bourgeois propaganda "... bends every effort to play down an even more important mission of the dictatorship of the proletariat, its educational mission, which is particularly important in Russia, where the proletariat constitutes a minority of the population. Yet in Russia this mission must be given priority, for we must prepare the masses to build up socialism."²

Lenin advanced a series of fundamental propositions which spelled out the Party's new approach to the tasks of propaganda and education in the conditions of socialist construction. *These propositions marked the Party's transition from old-type propaganda to new-type propaganda which could meet the requirements and tasks of a new historical period.*

Inasmuch as the main policy under socialism is economic construction and the Party's economic strategy, "... agitation and propaganda will play a role of tremendous and ever growing importance".³ This definition of Lenin's of the place and role of agitation and propaganda in the life of the new society applies not just to a particular situation or a brief period of time, but has fundamental importance for an understanding of the content of the ideological activity of the Marxist-

Leninist Party in connection with the implementation of its ultimate goal—the construction of a communist society.

This statement of the problem constituted a new contribution to the Marxist interpretation of socialist propaganda and political education. This approach to the problem was prompted by a particular set of circumstances, including these:

—one of the fundamental principles of Marxism, and Lenin repeatedly emphasized it, is that "the greater the scope and extent of historical events, the greater is the number of people participating in them, and, contrariwise, the more profound the change we wish to bring about, the more must we rouse an interest and an intelligent attitude towards it, and convince more millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary"¹:

—politics and ideology in the bourgeois outlook on the world used to be separated from economics; in a socialist society both become a matter for the working class to engage in, a common cause for the entire people;

—"all propaganda for communism must be conducted in a way that will amount to practical guidance of the state's development. Communism must be made comprehensible to the masses of the workers so that they will regard it as their own cause".²

On the basis of these fundamental socio-political and economic propositions which characterized a fundamentally new historical situation, Lenin made the following conclusion on the necessity of changing radically the content of mass agitation and propaganda activity: "Propaganda of the old type describes and illustrates what communism is. This kind of propaganda is now useless, for we have to show in practice how socialism is to be built. All our propaganda must be based on the political experience of economic development."³ Thus

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 419.

² V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at an All-Russia Conference of Political Education Workers of Gubernia and Uyezd Departments, November 3, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 364.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Eighth All-Russia Congress of Soviets, December 22-29, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 498.

² V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at an All-Russia Conference of Political Workers of Gubernia and Uyezd Departments, November 3, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 372.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 371.

in the Party's ideological activities as it became the ruling party which guided and directed the entire work of building up a new society, a fundamentally new function appeared which propaganda of the old type did not have—the function of the mass economic education whose importance grows with the growth in the scale of economic development.

The Soviet Communist Party has always been guided by these fundamental propositions of Lenin's and proceeded from the actual requirements of economic development. After the 24th Congress of the CPSU in 1971 a far-flung network of economic educational centres was set up which tens of millions of people have already attended and millions are attending now. The 25th Party Congress considered economic education of the working people as an inseparable integral aspect of the Party's entire ideological activity, as a major instrument for disseminating throughout the country advanced experience in labour organization, for applying to production the latest achievements of science and engineering, for organizing socialist emulation on a sound, business-like footing.

Propaganda, Lenin emphasized, should be based on living concrete examples in every area of life. Lenin insisted on the closest attention to be given to the work-a-day side of life where most of the new things originate and are built up, where maximum attention should be directed, maximum publicity and open criticism of the worthless and bad and promotion of the successful and good things are required. Lenin's idea of the fundamental importance of the everyday aspect of life was emphasized by the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

The effectiveness of propaganda can be measured only against practical improvement in the state of affairs. Lenin wrote: "Political education is much more than... propaganda—it means practical results, it means teaching the people how to achieve these results."¹ Just as there can be no economics without po-

litics, so there can be no communist education of working people without their active involvement in economic development and production activity. In turn the level of consciousness, education and culture generally, the ability to work, the quality of the people's skills in managing economic matters, in running production, largely determine how soon and fully the tremendous potential inherent in developed socialism will be translated into reality.

According to Lenin, "...economic power... affects the deepest foundations of everyday human existence".¹ It is therefore hard to overestimate the ideological and educational effects of both concrete results of economic management and the feedback effect of the ideological and moral factors on production. Leonid Brezhnev underscored in his speech at the 25th Party Congress: "In putting forward a broad social programme the Party acts in the belief that its fulfillment will help to enhance the labour activity of workers, collective farmers and intellectuals, and serve each person as a further incentive to work better. There is no need to explain how important this is. For the growth of production, an increase in output and an improvement of quality are the main and decisive conditions for raising the people's standard of living."²

The relevance of such an approach both to ideology and to economics is borne out by the life of socialist society. It is common knowledge that any bad decision taken by an economic executive or manager entails, apart from everything else, moral costs, and a subjectivist slogan launched by propagandists loses its attractiveness and cogency if it is divorced from the down-to-earth economic foundation and thus damages economic development.

The Tenth Five-Year Plan covering 1976 to 1980 has been proclaimed to be one of efficiency and product quality. The quality of performance is not only a key production and economic problem but it is also a social and educational issue. This makes more exacting

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The New Economic Policy and the Tasks of the Political Education Departments", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 77.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech at the First Congress of Economic Councils, May 26, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 409.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 50.

and varied demands on such aspects of ideological activity as educating people in the spirit of a conscientious and responsible attitude to their jobs, raising the effectiveness of socialist emulation, as well as more exacting demands on the volume and content of economic propaganda relating to production.

The practical success in economic development is today measured by quality of performance on the job and product quality. This determines the content of labour and economic education today. The current scientific and technological revolution dictates an improvement in the quality of performance and end product.

When the country was taking her first steps on the road to socialism Lenin wrote: "The task that the Soviet government must set the people in all its scope is—learn to work."¹ Returning to the same idea later Lenin wrote: "To learn how to work is now the main, the truly national task of the Soviet Republic."² Lenin saw a major source of strength and a guarantee of the inevitable total victory of communism in the practical achievement of a higher, better organization of labour as compared with what is available under capitalism, in a conscientious attitude to work and in the ability to work in a new way.

The present-day approach to the quality of performance on the job in the USSR is a direct extension and development of Lenin's original idea applied to the tasks of the scientific and technological revolution in a developed socialist society. However rapid the progress of technology, however impressive and momentous the discoveries made by scientists, work will never become a pastime, an amusement but will continue to be what it has always been, a serious matter which one has to learn to do well. That this is so has been borne out by the course of the current scientific and technological revolution.

The uninterrupted, continuous functioning of modern production and of the latest technological systems gives added urgency to the need for the partici-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 259.

² V. I. Lenin, "A Fly in the Ointment", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 368.

pants of production to develop "an internal code of conduct and ethics" suitable for the high level of organization of modern production, for a greater sense of responsibility and organization of all its participants. Thus arises a complex and far-flung system of "feedback relationships": man and production. Progressive changes affecting the content and character of labour are of a dual character. On the one hand, scientific and technological progress, in making manual and mental work easier, releases men from arduous, monotonous operations, but on the other, it makes new demands on the men on the job which particularly affect their intellectual and emotional make-up in the first instance.

The findings of research in engineering psychology indicate that the advent of new mass professions and trades: traffic controllers, operators, computer programmers, etc., the functioning of man in macrosystems, call for quick thinking, instant memorizing and prompt response, the ability to foresee the onset of certain events, to compute their probability, to evaluate the situation objectively, particularly in emergencies, to anticipate events and plan actions accordingly.

Unfortunately, this second aspect of the problem is not always given the same close attention as the first gets and this may give rise to illusory ideas about the essence of the scientific and technological revolution and the character of work today. The entire course of the scientific and technological progress of socialist society has provided incontestable proof of the correctness of Marx's prediction that "genuinely free labour... is a devilishly serious business..."¹ Of great importance in a socialist society are those social aspects of labour, vocational training and career guidance which help the younger generation at the start of their adulthood to see what they should do in life and what sort of human beings they should be.

The scientific and technological revolution under socialism accentuates the problem "production and mores". The economic education of the working people also covers strictly moral aspects, for the ability to

¹ Karl Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie (Rotenwerk)*, Moskau, 1939, S. 505.

manage economic processes, to be an efficient worker, is inseparable from socialist moral principles, from conscientious attitude to work. Production, labour, work and morality are all interconnected in a socialist society.

Moral principles and standards have a tremendous role to play not only in family and everyday relations with other members of the community but also, and perhaps even more so, in the social and production sphere of life—in places of work, in the economic sphere. The uninterrupted functioning of complex social organism and technical systems, the progress of social transformations and the normal functioning of large working collectives are largely dependent on the moral qualities of the people involved.

Not surprisingly the 25th Congress of the CPSU emphasized the inseparable unity of labour and morality, of production and morality. Not surprisingly recent artistic and journalistic works on the "production theme" have triggered off lively public discussions. The explanation here is not the public's interest in the details of the production technology in question, although that too is of interest as a product of the scientific and technological revolution, but rather the moral searchings of the characters, the dramatic moral situations which develop in the sphere of production, that most important sphere of human activity, in which many qualities of a personality are put to an acid moral test.

But not only moral factors influence production. Production often has a feedback influence on the sphere of morals. A growing sense of conscientiousness, a growing level of activity and initiative can be achieved not only by ideological means. These are equally dependent on the socio-political and educational results of economic activity, on the moral climate existing in each individual collective, on how far this climate contributes to the active involvement of working people in the discussion and running of the affairs of their collective, to the establishment of an attitude of respect to the working man consistent with an exacting attitude to him.

A socialist collective is a cell of socialist society where the future of economic plans is largely decided,

where people learn the skills of self-government and acquire moral and political qualities. The educational impact of a working collective in the USSR has been greatly increased since the introduction of social planning when the future of a factory or plant and any other enterprise is decided by members of its work force themselves.

The enhanced importance of working collectives has been formalized constitutionally. Article 8 of the Constitution of the USSR states: "Work collectives promote socialist emulation, the spread of progressive methods of work, and the strengthening of production discipline, educate their members in the spirit of communist morality, and strive to enhance their political consciousness and raise their cultural level and skills and qualifications."

Production is politics, economics and education. The practical fusion of the political and labour education finds its expression in socialist emulation. Emulation as the communist method of building the new society is of tremendous economic significance but it also has no less important socio-political and educational aspects.

Each new stage in the evolution of Soviet society gives rise to corresponding forms of emulation. Many of its forms that originated in past years are still alive albeit in modified form. The concrete forms of emulation undergo change as new initiatives are taken and new movements are launched, since they all have different social, technical and economic tasks to tackle which arise at different stages of the emulation campaigns. Of great importance today is emulation to raise labour productivity and production efficiency, to improve performance and product quality.

In the age of the scientific and technological revolution that has brought about far-reaching changes affecting the country's economy and character of labour, comprehensive solutions to production problems, of great significance is not only the experience of individual front-ranking workers but also that of whole collectives. With the scale of production what it is today, the importance of advanced experience has grown immeasurably as even an increment of one per cent now weighs far more in terms of

improved labour productivity, increased amount of raw materials and working time saved than at any time in the past. In these days of the scientific and technological revolution advanced experience ages quickly. This calls for an efficient and rapid system of disseminating the achievements of production innovators, of front-ranking collectives, for a quick and profound assessment of the new things that scientific and technological progress and the creativity and technical ingenuity of the men on the job bring with them.

Socialist emulation today is an intricate intertwining of production, economic, technical and organizational, moral and political factors. Its effectiveness depends on the simultaneous participation of all its ingredients in a common effort. The most high-minded and noble motives and enthusiasm have to be reinforced both by financial inducements and a superior organization at every stage of the present-day production cycle from raw material processing to the end product, if they are to come to fruition in practical results. In other words, all aspects of emulation—economic, production-technological and moral-ideological—have to be examined comprehensively as forming an integrated unit, and never in isolation. Emulation is essentially a composite phenomenon and it can only develop successfully when all its components are integrated into an organic unit.

From the standpoint of ideological support for emulation, priority attention has to be paid to keeping the hand on the pulse of workers' creativity and initiative, to supporting initiatives, to giving the widest publicity to emulation drives, to the comparability of the results achieved by different participants in an emulation drive, to forms of social recognition and rewarding of the front-ranking members of the emulation drive, and to the widest dissemination of the advanced experience.

The ideological and political aspect of emulation consists in its creative content when the workers themselves decide what they are prepared to undertake and monitor the fulfillment of production pledges and sum up the results of emulation. All this contributes not only to the ever fuller utilization of latent economic reserves but also to the development of the democratic principles of emulation, to involving wider masses in the direct running of

production. In effect socialist emulation today is the living embodiment of Lenin's idea of emulation as a unity between the principle of personal self-interest and responsibility to the community.¹

3. The Ideological and Moral Problems of the Socialist Way of Life

Ideological activity as a target-oriented and substantive form of activity reveals itself in its attitude to the formation of a new way of life in which moral standards acquire ever increasing importance. As early as 1918 Lenin in his *The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Power* disclosed the general political significance of the so-called "hackneyed" and "trivial" copy-book moral truths in the building of the new society. Such commandments as: "Observe the strictest labour discipline", "Keep regular and honest accounts of money", "Manage economically", "Do not steal", "Do not be lazy", acquire a new meaning having become part of the moral standards of the socialist way of life. Lenin saw realization of communist ideals as inseparable from strengthening the moral health of society.

In fulfilling Lenin's behests the Communist Party has been attaching fundamental importance to the moral education of Soviet people, to strengthening the standards and rules of socialist society, to improving the socialist way of life.

Moral education is treated by the CPSU as a key problem of its entire ideological activity which is inseparable from such aspects of communist education as ideological-political and labour education. Leonid Brezhnev emphasized in his speech at the 25th Party Congress: "... Nothing adds so much to the stature of the individual as a constructive attitude to life and a conscious approach to one's duty to society, when matching words and deeds becomes a rule of daily behaviour."²

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "The New Economic Policy and the Tasks of the Political Education Departments", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 68-70.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 94.

The humane nature of the socialist economy whose supreme goal is the welfare of working people, the humane character of socialist social relations in which man to man is a comrade, the real character of socialist democracy in which each working man feels himself to be the architect of his own destiny and master of the country, give rise to a new scale of moral values, a morality of collectivism and comradely mutual assistance, assert the dignity of the individual, his social responsibility, create a new system of moral values. At the same time socialist moral convictions are shaped by the socialist way of life not automatically but as a result of a purposeful ideological activity maintained by the Party and the Soviet state and assert themselves in an uncompromising struggle against prejudices and bad habits which have been "inherited" from the world of private ownership.

The still persisting negative phenomena in the life of Soviet society are social and moral anomalies under socialism. These are antipodes of communist morality. As the 25th Congress of the CPSU underscored: "The higher the level of our society in its development, the more intolerable are the still occurring departures from the socialist rules of morality. Acquisitiveness, proprietary tendencies, hooliganism, red tape and indifference to one's fellow humans run against the very grain of our system."¹ At the present stage of the development of socialism, against the background of tremendous achievements in its social, political, cultural and spiritual development, violations of social norms come into sharp conflict with the socialist way of life, with the increased and rising level of moral and legal consciousness of society, with the more exacting demands being made on everything that determines and shapes the ideological and moral make-up of Soviet people.

The problem of moral education is a complex and multi-dimensional issue. The improvement of the socialist way of life, the education of the Soviet people in the spirit of a thrifty and caring attitude to the people's property, the establishment of high standards of efficiency in labour and behaviour in daily life, the introduction of the lofty standards of communist morality, these are the key

¹ *Ibid.*

issues of public life in the USSR. Communism presupposes, apart from material and economic abundance, far-reaching profound changes in human psychology, a matching spiritual and cultural basis. The trouble is that proprietary attitudes, views and traditions have been in the making for centuries and have acquired, as Lenin put it, the "enormous force of habit".¹ To overcome the force of historical inertia in the moral and psychological sphere is one of the most difficult tasks to be tackled in the process of remaking society along socialist lines.

The history of the revolutionary proletarian movement in Russia is a history of a long struggle against the petty-bourgeois pressure on the working class and the Party. Bolshevism as an ideological and political current arose and gained strength in the course of its struggle against petty-bourgeois attitudes and always devoted close attention to this issue in all its policies and ideology. The struggle against petty-bourgeois attitude, as Lenin repeatedly pointed out, can never be successfully carried out through coercion alone, it demands an economic and moral education and re-education of the masses.

The dynamics of negative phenomena are also influenced by such historical and economic factors as the widely varying degree of the economic and social maturity of successive stages of socialism, the persistence for a long historical period of substantial distinctions between mental and manual work, between conditions of urban and rural life and the existence, alongside the socialist sector, of petty-commodity sectors at different stages in the development of productive forces, i.e., all the survivals "of the old in the new", inevitable in the first phase of communist society.

Aware of the full range of historical and material conditions the Communists have always attached great importance to the education of the masses. Among the socio-economic, legal and other measures, ideological methods and procedures have an active social role to play in the effort to overcome anti-social phenomena. As the 25th Congress of the CPSU pointed out: "In combating such phenomena, there is a need to make full use of the opin-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421.

ion of the working collective, criticism in the press, methods of persuasion and the force of the law—all the instruments at our disposal.”¹

The task of moral education of the masses is a positive task, one of developing a constructive attitude to life and a conscious attitude to one's duty as a member of society. More often than not it is people who keep themselves aloof from the life of the community, who withdraw into the shell of egocentrism that are the repository of moral principles that have had their day, of prejudices and bad habits. Lenin wrote in this connection: “. . . In this matter laws alone are not enough. A vast amount of educational, organisational and cultural work is required; this cannot be done rapidly by legislation but demands a vast amount of work over a long period.”²

Problems of the comparative worth of material and spiritual values, of the indissoluble unity between traditional standards of morality and those of communist morality, of the social activity of members of society, are central to the moral education of the masses today.

The increasing concentration of the socialist economy on the better satisfaction of the growing material needs of working people makes the problem of the comparative worth of material and spiritual values more urgent than ever before. The right-wing revisionist and leftist propagandists are seeking to represent rising living standards in the USSR as evidence of its society degenerating into bourgeois consumerism.

It is wrong, however, to see poverty or low living standards as a guarantee of the continuing revolutionary spirit of the masses, and to regard steadily improving living standards as a threat of the eventual degeneration of socialist society into one dominated by bourgeois attitudes. This view is typical of various forms of petty-bourgeois socialism which either totally ignores the material conditions of human existence or rushing to the other extreme proclaims the hedonistic slogan “let's live while we live” as the aim and meaning of socialism.

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 94.

² V. I. Lenin, “Eighth Congress of R.C.P.(B)”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 179.

Communist ideology and psychology rejects both the worship of material things of life as an end in itself and a disdainful attitude to the material conditions of human existence. A really well-rounded man is the product of a happy mix of adequate material and spiritual prerequisites which are created in the course of socialist and communist construction. When men live in the shadow of need there can be no question of any full and balanced development of the individual. On the other hand, an abundance of the material things of life is not an end in itself for a communist society but rather a necessary condition without which there can be no free and balanced spiritual development of the individual.

It is wrong to imagine that the communist society of the future will be a kingdom of egalitarian poverty. This is a typically petty-bourgeois view which, when translated into reality, results in a caricature of the new social system—“barracks communism”. Lenin wrote: “Petty-bourgeois socialism assumes that it is possible for all to become ‘equalised’ proprietors . . .”¹ The record since then has fully exposed the economic futility and the socio-political reactionary nature of the ideas of petty-bourgeois socialism.

The real socialist solution to the problem of equality has nothing to do with a desire to develop a society of standardized individuals, to “equalize” human abilities and talents as bourgeois propagandists usually make out. Lenin emphasized: “. . . When socialists speak of equality they always mean *social* equality, equality of social status, and not by any means the physical and mental equality of individuals.”²

The new Soviet Constitution states in this connection: “In accordance with the communist ideal—the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all—the state pursues the aim of giving citizens more and more real opportunities to apply their creative energies, abilities, and talents, and to develop their personalities in every way.” For this to become a reality what is necessary above all is a solid and adequate ma-

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Land Question and the Fight for Freedom”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 438.

² V. I. Lenin, “A Liberal Professor on Equality”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 146.

terial base. The CPSU, always loyal to the essence of scientific communism, is doing everything necessary to ensure that living standards in the USSR improve with every year, to ensure that more and better housing is available, more and better consumer goods are produced, that the needs of the population in every kind of food products are fully met, and more and better services are available. But it does not mean that the Soviet Union's socialist society is heading for a bourgeois-type consumerism as the bourgeois and revisionist critics of existing socialism are trying to make out.

It is not consumption as such that makes society consumer-oriented. Consumption takes on a utilitarian character under specific social forms associated with the capitalist mode of production as a passing phase of mankind's historical evolution. A quite different situation obtains under socialism but this, of course, does not mean that under socialism all survivals and throw-backs of petty-bourgeois consumerist psychology are automatically ruled out.

Socialism implies a higher level of human needs. This elevation presupposes that along with the rising trend of the material welfare of people their ideological and moral standards also rise and the cultural and intellectual life of society is becoming more diversified, meaningful and interesting. We should emphasize in this context the vast potential for enriching the moral and intellectual life of society that literature and art have, since they shape directly man's inner world, his moral principles and ideological and moral make-up. Leonid Brezhnev in his speech to the 25th Congress of the CPSU stressed the great importance and urgency of the moral aspect of the problem: "Another topic to which our literature and art have devoted much effort... deserves to be mentioned. It is a topic of morality, of moral quests. Though there have been some failures here, the achievements have been greater. It is to the credit of our writers and artists that they seek to bring out the best human qualities, like firmness of principle, honesty and depth of emotion, always in line with the sound and solid principles of our communist morality."¹

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 96.

It is this approach to the problem that helps one to gain an insight into two questions of fundamental importance whose successful solution has a direct bearing on the effectiveness of moral education. These are questions of "moral reflection" and the role of ordinary, traditional standards of morality shared by all mankind, in shaping the moral make-up of the man of the communist future.

We believe it would be wrong to counterpose the two parts of the "moral reflection" in the abstract by seeing the former as "an absolute good" and the latter as "an absolute evil". Any action by an individual outside the framework of "moral reflection", outside definitive moral principles in social terms, may even turn out to be more dangerous than pure "reflection" outside action.

Reflection understood not in the sense of abstract moralizing but in the sense of moral self-evaluation, the moral rationalization of one's life experience, moral quests and assimilation of social standards of morality is a necessary prerequisite of the behaviour of a member of socialist society in the broad sense, a solid basis of the individual's moral reliability. At the same time lack of need for moral reflection, its nihilistic rejection is often used to justify opportunism in life and moral surrender in complex circumstances one may find oneself in. Whereas reflection outside action results in abstract moralizing and in escape from the real problems of life, an action outside moral reflection degenerates into reckless activism, devoid of moral principles, into "active ignorance".

The human personality is a unity of intellect, character and world outlook. Intellect interpreted as profound and adequate knowledge, adherence to universally recognized cultural standards, independence and originality of thinking as reflected in a profound understanding of traditional human values, orientation towards honest work and creative activity, is inseparable from character, from lofty moral principles and the reliability of the individual, and from firmness of his world outlook.

Character and world outlook determine the style of thinking and mentality of an individual, his conscious choice within the complex system of everyday "mundane co-ordinates" and guarantee that all he says and does has been thoroughly thought out. Only action and a constructive attitude to life can be a reliable indication of a ratio-

nal and carefully thought out attitude to things. Marx wrote in his early years as a philosopher: "He who would not prefer to build the whole world out of his own resources, to be a creator of the world, rather than to be eternally bothering about himself, has already been anathematised by the spirit, he is under an interdict, but in the opposite sense; he is expelled from the temple and deprived of the eternal enjoyment of the spirit and left to sing lullabies about his own private bliss and to dream about himself at night."¹

Sociological relativism which the ideological opponents of Marxism have been trying to ascribe to it is in fact alien to Marxism in the latter's approach to moral values. Social determinism which Marxism-Leninism expounds, by no means eliminates either conscience or moral evaluation, on the contrary, it places both on the only sound and truly scientific footing. Communist morality is made up of two basic elements:

—the revolutionary morality of the working class which is of special importance for the moral development of the society;

—ordinary, traditional standards of morality and justice which have been crystallized in the centuries-old moral experience of working masses in their struggle against exploitation and oppression, against the official morality of the ruling classes. It was Marx who was the first to put forward the task "...to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations".²

Marxists, then, far from rejecting the wealth of moral experience gained by mankind, disclose its social meaning and significance.

Ordinary, traditional standards of morality such as honesty, fellowship, a sense of personal dignity, conscience, decency, have a direct bearing on the formation of more complex social standards of morality and form the latter's foundation. Without firm moral principles there can be

¹ K. Marx, "Notebooks on Epicurean Philosophy". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 468-69.

² K. Marx, "Inaugural Address of the Working Men Association". In: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, p. 18.

no question of the individual's ideological soundness. Lenin made no bones about it when he wrote: "...Careerists have no ideas, and no honesty."¹

None of the elements of morality exists in isolation, all form part of a closely integrated system. Ordinary standards of behaviour in the community and universal standards of morality do not exist in isolation from prevailing class relations, from the class nucleus of a particular system of morality. In emphasizing this dependence Marx wrote that the conscience of a republican is different from that of a royalist, that of a property owner is different from that of one who owns no property, that of a thinking person is different from that of one incapable of thought.² Lenin underscored the dialectics of the class and the universal when he pointed out that morality serves the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism, it serves the purpose of helping human society rise to a higher level.³

Relationships between the universal and the class are not static within a particular system of morality. In contrast to bourgeois morality communist morality not only covers ordinary universally recognized standards of morality which it enriches and develops, but also aims at making them permanent rules of behaviour for all members of society. Leonid Brezhnev emphasized this in his address to the 17th Congress of the Soviet Komsomol: "Our communist morality inherits by right and develops the humanistic norms of ethics elaborated by mankind. Industry, honesty, modesty, personal dignity, comradeship and mutual respect are all inseparable features of the moral image of the Soviet man."⁴

This dialectics of the universal and the class is acquiring an added dimension nowadays in connection, among other things, with the truly global problems facing mankind. The nature of such problems as prevention of a world

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of R.C.P.(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 209.

² See K. Marx, F. Engels, "The Trial of Gottschalk and His Comrades". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 189.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Youth Leagues", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 294-95.

⁴ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 430-31.

nuclear war, environmental protection and nature conservation, demographic problems, the exploration of outer space, etc. is such that their successful tackling calls for the co-operation of all countries and peoples, all who have a vital stake in the effective resolution of these problems. That representatives of different social systems and social forces should concert their efforts to beat these problems is axiomatic, and more and more people around the world are coming to realize this as they increasingly press their respective governments to lose no time in initiating a world-wide co-operative effort to solve these problems. The struggle of different class interests in these areas is increasingly assuming the character of not only a direct alternative to the recognition of the need for joint efforts (the popularity of this idea is such that even the most extremist groups are being compelled to recognize it if they are to maintain their influence on the masses) but also as an alternative to the choice of a particular way, method or form of a co-operative effort to tackle these global problems. In this situation the inclusion of universal elements in the ideological positions of socialism as their organic components is becoming particularly manifest and a major factor of the sharpening ideological struggle now raging around the global problems of today, in the struggle for the minds and hearts of the peoples of the world. It is a major instrument for isolating the reactionary forces, for winning over to the side of the world revolutionary workers' movement of new allies, for expanding the base of the anti-imperialist struggle and for enhancing the authority and prestige of existing socialism.

The gigantic scale of economic changes, the development of socialist democracy coupled with the current scientific and technological progress combine to make exacting demands on the level of consciousness, organization and responsibility of people. As the 25th Congress of the CPSU put it: "...Democracy is inconceivable without discipline and a sound public order. It is a responsible approach by every citizen to his duties and to the people's interests that constitutes the only reliable basis for the fullest embodiment of the principles of socialist democracy and true freedom for the individual."¹

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 103.

The education of the masses in the spirit of social discipline, strict observance by all citizens of their duties to society is inseparable from the further improvement of socialist democracy. Lenin wrote: "...A state is strong when the people are politically conscious. It is strong when the people know everything, can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously."¹ This formula sums up the new view of the sources of strength and power of a state. No one in the entire history of political thought had looked at the problem the way Lenin did, relying on the living practice of the world's first socialist state of workers and peasants. A state is strong provided its people know everything and are prepared to do everything consciously—this is the essence of Lenin's conclusion which linked together the problem of socialist statehood and real democracy, the rights and duties of the individual, communist education and the socio-political and labour activity of the masses, their direct participation in running the affairs of state, matters of public life and production. This Leninist principle has now been enshrined in the new Constitution of the USSR whose function is to expand and deepen socialist democracy in Soviet society.

The tasks of moral education and the amount of work to be done in this area are growing as new generations of Soviet people reach adulthood who have to learn to live the communist way in different social circumstances from those that obtained in the past, who have to assimilate the wealth of experience gained by the older generations and acquire, in Lenin's phrase, "the high degree of class-consciousness, firmness of character, perception and wide political outlook...".² The materials of the 23rd, 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU, the speeches and addresses of Leonid Brezhnev at Komsomol and youth congresses and rallies, other party documents devote close attention to the pressing problems of the education, and upbringing of young people and their life and labour activity today.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 256.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 266.

The Party documents have identified specific forms and ways of involving the country's younger generation in the national effort to build a new society, of getting them to assimilate the fine socialist traditions of the Soviet society, to gain a profound knowledge of revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism. Thus, a major ideological and political task associated with the fact that each successive generation begin their adult lives in a changed social environment has been successfully solved. This environment far from being static, is highly dynamic and differs from the environment that prevailed 30, 20 and even ten years ago.

Lenin paid constant attention to the relevance of educating the younger generation by forms and methods corresponding to the actual conditions prevailing in society. He wrote: "Things are harder for our generation than they were for our fathers. But in one respect we are luckier than our fathers. *We have begun to learn and are rapidly learning to fight*—and to fight not as individuals, as the best of our fathers thought, not for the slogans of bourgeois speechifiers that are alien to us in spirit, but for our slogans, the slogans of our class. We are fighting better than our fathers did. Our children will fight better than we do, and *they will be victorious*."¹

The task set by Lenin "first, to learn, secondly, to learn, and thirdly, to learn . . ."² sums up the programme for Soviet youth, a programme which takes on a specific character at each successive stage of the evolution of Soviet society.³ The younger generation's first task is to assimilate the social experience gained by the preceding generations. Lenin wrote: ". . . Young workers need the experience of veteran *fighters* against oppression and exploitation, of those who have organised many strikes, who have taken part in a number of revolutions, who are wise in revolutionary traditions, and have a broad political outlook."⁴

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Working Class and Neomalthusianism", *Collected Works*, Vol. 49, p. 236.

² V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 488-89.

³ See E. M. Tyazhelnikov, *The League of Young Leninists*, Moscow, 1977 (in Russian).

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "Preface to the Russian Translation of K. Kautsky's Pamphlet: *Forces and Prospects of the Russian Revolution*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, p. 412.

The revolutionary traditions of socialism contain fundamentally new social experience, and to assimilate it is a truly creative task. The wealth of experience already accumulated should be applied in the context of new historical conditions and when the task is to assimilate traditions the first practical question to be resolved is one of the substance of this experience rather than of its external forms, the task is how to apply this experience in new and changing social circumstances. It is nonsense of course to mechanically extrapolate a tradition into a new specific situation. A tradition lives on provided it is enriched and developed on the basis of tackling new tasks that arise. And the tackling of new tasks cannot be carried out by analogy. It presupposes a sound scientific interpretation of the experience accumulated and an analysis of the changed situation.

Sometimes people ask: "Are today's young people better or worse than the preceding generation?" This question has sparked lively debates. We believe that it is wrong to state the question in this way, from a scientific point of view, and totally irrelevant to approach it from a practical point of view. This statement of the problem suffers from abstract moralizing as it ignores concrete conditions, social, economic, scientific and technological, cultural and everyday circumstances which surround the entry of each new generation into the country's socio-political and labour life.

Each new generation as it reaches adulthood, enters into a situation determined by a totality of productive forces, a specific level of scientific and technological progress, specific cultural standards, traditions, skills, habits, etc. In other words, it enters a unique socio-political atmosphere which shapes the outlook and behaviour of young men and women. The younger generation's first task is to assimilate this sum total of social wealth which has been accumulated by previous generations, and to adapt to it socially. The ideological and political education of young people is of tremendous importance in solving this task. Without a sound theoretical knowledge no rational attitude to life and its scale of values is possible any more than the ability to take one's bearings in the complex and often contradictory welter of events in today's world. Without a sound theoretical knowledge it is

impossible for anyone to develop a firm and reliable world outlook.

The conversion of socialism from a utopia into a strict scientific theory gave a new dimension to the problem of helping people to understand its principles and embrace them. It should be noted that *the character of ideology determines the method of its study and assimilation*. The scientific content of socialist ideology can only be assimilated by one method, and that is by concentrating on the rational substance of the socialist ideology when its theory appears not as ready-made "knowledge" but as a creatively evolving doctrine, as a theory and methodology capable of serving as a guide and a reliable compass in identifying and tackling the tasks of the day and those of tomorrow.

Marx ridiculed the dogmatic attitude to science when he wrote: "What use to me is an individual who knows all about mathematical literature but who fails to understand mathematics? . . . Such an individual is noted for a peculiar quality in that he fails to understand the *issues* involved and that is the reason why his eclecticism is merely a matter of collecting ready-made *answers* from every field."¹ It is not enough therefore to have a knowledge of mathematical literature, one has to have a grasp of mathematics, i.e., the creative spirit of the science. The same applies equally to social knowledge.

The younger generation faces the task of interiorization and socialization, i.e., assimilation of prevailing social norms and adaptation to a particular social type of life, way of life. It is true of course that "tastes differ" but the tastes, for all their highly individual nature bear the imprint of the social milieu of an individual. To be a member of society and remain free from observing the standards of behaviour in that society is impossible. Not surprisingly imperialist propaganda has been so assiduously trying to impose on the younger generation of socialist countries the "tastes" and scale of values prevailing in bourgeois society, its inhumane morals, by passing them off as the hallmarks of the behaviour of today's younger generation.

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 30, S. 628.

Some publicists and sociologists while condemning quite rightly administrative interference in the sphere of shaping tastes and attitudes as ineffective, overlook another important circumstance which is that tastes and attitudes are largely shaped by upbringing and education. No society can be neutral or indifferent to the shaping of tastes among the rising generation. Therefore, it is important that the moral education of children should start as early as possible, to ensure that they are educated in the spirit of respect for work and fellow human beings, in the spirit of comradeship, honesty and decency, to impress on the young that in a socialist society the rights and duties of an individual are indivisible and interdependent.

Problems of the ideological education of the younger generation are being tackled by the socialist society in a situation marked by an uncompromising and sharp ideological struggle on the international scene. Youth problems are now in the focus of growing interest on the part of representatives of all ideological currents and trends.

The continuing aggravation of conflicts and contradictions of modern capitalism, the explosive development of the scientific and technological revolution amid economic and social upheavals rocking bourgeois society, have confronted the younger generation with the problem of social choice, of taking a definitive attitude to the key problems of today's world, such as the problems of war and peace, the direction of social progress, the utilization of the fruits of the scientific and technological progress, of the social purpose of art and literature, of work, of moral values and cultural values and the meaning of human existence.

These problems have relevance not only for the younger generation. They are at the centre of ideological struggle in which each class tries to win the younger generation over to its side. Youth is not, of course, something socially homogeneous as bourgeois and revisionist ideologists would have us believe. In terms of its social differentiation youth reproduces basically the class structure of today's capitalist society and its contradictions.

The generation gap and violent conflicts between the younger generation and the older generation are a perfectly logical development in capitalist society today. Bourgeois ideologists, compelled to admit their existence, are trying to focus public opinion on events and phe-

nomena of secondary importance, emphasizing all manner of "scandalous" forms of protest by some young people against the bourgeois way of life. Secondly, they are careful to pass over in silence the social root causes of the generation gap in today's capitalism in an attempt to blame everything on demographic, psychological and biological factors which they analyze in isolation from the prevailing social conditions.

Their social and economic position largely determines what attitude a particular section of the young people takes towards society. Needless to say, this does not happen by itself. A lot depends on the level of the young people's awareness of their position and on the degree of ideological influence particular classes exert on the young people. We should also take into account the political and ideological immaturity of young people, their inexperience and lack of a class-oriented outlook.

As for the scandalizing forms of behaviour, they represent a form of the decay of the bourgeois way of life, a product of its disintegration. Strictly speaking, this development is not new. In his day Marx also noted that criticism of the failure of a social system may take the form of "...*debauched frivolity*, which realises and ridicules the hollow lack of ideas of the existing state of things, but only in order, having got rid of all rational and moral ties, to *make sport* of the decaying ruins, and then itself to be made sport of by them and dissolved."¹

Marx thus defines the social position in the approach to and evaluation of similar phenomena which have proliferated particularly widely in the last decades in the West. It should be stressed, first of all, that such forms of "protest", far from having anything to do with a genuine revolutionary spirit, are petty-bourgeois both in substance and in terms of manifestation. As for the social nature of this "criticism", it is a typical petty-bourgeois reaction which rejects ordinary universal standards of morality and behaviour in human society rather than the bourgeois way of life. It is not a matter of chance that it is being cultivated and encouraged by every means

¹ K. Marx, "Philosophical Manifesto of Historical School of Law". In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 205.

at the command of bourgeois propagandists. What is more, it has become a supplementary source of income for many capitalist companies which, by encouraging and fanning debauched frivolity, exploit it to derive fat profits out of the "entertainment industry".

But it is not only a matter of the commercial side of it. The ruling class has far more serious social and political motives. The monopoly bourgeoisie with its wealth of class experience and ability to maneuver realizes full well that such forms of protest, far from threatening any of the pillars of its domination, are in fact to its advantage for they help in diverting a proportion of the younger generation and public opinion from real problems. Using public opinion against such scandalizing forms of behaviour, the bourgeoisie is at the same time seeking to discredit genuinely revolutionary morals and ideas.

The record to date has convincingly shown that, deprived of correct social orientations, youth groups become easy prey for all manner of pseudo-revolutionary and fascist-type trends which try to exploit those young people who have lost their ideological and moral bearings for their own selfish ends. We should also bear in mind that under the pretext of maintaining law and order and "correcting morals" the monopoly bourgeoisie is building up its punitive forces in order to move them against genuinely revolutionary and progressive organizations, and to divert the younger generation from an active involvement in social and political life.

4. Ideology and Cultural-Historical Tradition

Ideological activity under developed socialism is characterized by an increased amount of tasks to be tackled in the field of culture and education. The important thing is to exploit to the full the great opportunities created by knowledge and high cultural standards as a source and accelerator of progressive trends in every sphere of public life.

Lenin saw experience and knowledge as the highest human achievement.¹ But he urged the people to "learn"

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "Fourth Conference of Trade Union and Factory Committees of Moscow", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 475.

not for the sake of a simple knowledge and wider cultural horizons. "To learn to work", "To learn to manage", "To learn the science of Communism"—this is what Lenin urged the people to do when he linked education, the acquisition of knowledge and culture with the tackling of specific problems of socialist construction. Social activity is usually at its highest and most effective when people think and work at a high level of efficiency, when the art of management and human relations are at a high level.

Culture in the Marxist sense is not just a phenomenon of human consciousness but it is a definite type of human activity which has a clearly defined social character. As well as being a form of consciousness of the real world, and a sum total of knowledge, etc., it is also a specific form and type of social activity embodied in high efficiency standards in work, in the character of human relations regulated by the rules of community living, in traditions and habits. Lenin pointed to this interpretation of the specific nature of culture when he emphasized that in matters of culture one may consider as conquered territory only that which has become a habit for many. He saw the development of culture as one of the most effective barriers to bureaucratic diversions.

From the standpoint of a practical understanding of culture as a specific form, type and character of human activity, its growing importance for the life of a socialist society becomes more apparent. Efficiency of production is also dependent on how successfully cultural problems are tackled.

The spiritual wealth of society, its cultural potential constitute an accurate yardstick of the free development of that society, an index of how progressive its ideology is. The preparations for the socialist revolution and the socialist construction that followed it made it imperative for the Communist Party to work out a comprehensive programme of cultural development, to define its position on a series of key problems of inter-relationship between ideology and culture.

Lenin's interpretation of ideology as a scientific system covers the question of traditions, the continuity of cultural progress since no system of scientific views can come into being out of nothing, away from the mainstream of

world civilization and the wealth of spiritual values accumulated by mankind. The story of the rise of Marxism is a good example. Any revolution is dialectical. On the one hand, a revolution signifies a clean break with tradition, but on the other, it implies the continuation, development and enrichment of traditions with new content. The specific solution of this question calls for a substantive approach to the historical tradition itself, the identification of its character and role in social development.

When Marx wrote of tradition as a nightmare weighing heavy on the minds of the living, in this specific context tradition appeared as a manifestation of hide-bound ways, as a method of preserving social forms that have had their day, as a means of the spiritual dictatorship of the exploiting class who has a stake in its constant reproduction. Marx carefully analyzed the record of class struggle in France between 1848 and 1852 and showed that tradition as hide-bound ways transformed into a myth, put Louis Bonaparte in power. The prejudices of the French peasantry which identified in its imagination the two Bonapartes played no mean role in the latter's rise to power. Lenin repeatedly pointed to the danger of this kind of prejudice and of its being exploited for the most reactionary ends. In order to restore the power of the capital in Russia, Lenin pointed out soon after the victorious October Socialist Revolution, the counter-revolution would try to rely on the prejudices of the peasants as against their common sense.¹

Prejudices are especially dangerous during the periods of upheaval when the new is often weaker than the old, when new social trends have not yet become crystallized in the mass consciousness. Such a situation arises, in Lenin's phrase, when "the whole of the old order 'has been turned upside down', and when the masses, who have been brought up under this old order, who imbibed with their mother's milk the principles, the habits, the traditions and beliefs of this order, do not and cannot see *what kind* of a new order is 'taking shape'... what social forces are *capable* of bringing release from the incalculable and exceptionally acute distress that is

¹ See V. I. Lenin, "First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 369.

characteristic of epochs of 'upheaval'".¹ In this social and psychological description Lenin was referring to the position of the backward patriarchal peasantry of the post-1861 Russia when, with serfdom abolished, capitalism was beginning to develop. But doubtless, this description goes beyond the framework of an evaluation of a particular historical situation and has general methodological significance for the study of the social consciousness and psychology of any "epoch of upheaval". It is precisely in periods of social upheaval that something new arises which does not fit into the system of beliefs and principles that took shape under the old order, and prejudices weigh particularly heavy upon the mass consciousness and often take the form of myths and a romantic idealization of the past, the form of apologetics for everything that was used to be yesterday. And in socio-political terms it is not of fundamental importance whether these prejudices and myths are accepted for sychophant considerations or because of the immaturity and ignorance of the individuals concerned, even though the distance between a sychophant and a man who is captive to his own illusions is, of course, tremendous.

From the viewpoint of the class struggle of the proletariat and the building of the new society the overcoming of such conservative and even reactionary traditions is a major task of education and an indispensable condition of the victory of socialist ideology in the minds of the masses. Lenin emphasized the sheer complexity and difficulty of the problem when he wrote in the early years of Soviet power: "It is necessary to overcome the enormous force of habit and conservatism . . .".²

At the same time the Marxist view of the matter is not anti-traditionalist. Tradition is a vehicle and repository of social experience and as such it may serve the tasks of the day and those of the future. A tradition which is capable of development, renewal and enrichment is a living tradition without which continuity

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Lev Tolstoy and His Epoch", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 51.

² V. I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 421.

of social development is impossible, as is social progress including that of a socialist society. This, essentially, is how Marx approached the issue. Lenin developed Marx's approach by showing that Russia's Social-Democrats were representatives and heirs of the revolutionary-democratic heritage.

The unfounded assertions about the alleged rejection by the Russian Social-Democrats of "the heritage", about their clean break with the traditions of the best and most advanced part of Russian society, about their breaking the democratic continuity, etc., etc., were qualified by Lenin as "inventions" and "bad inventions" at that. Lenin demonstrated that the Russian Marxists had inherited the democratic traditions of past generations.

In the Marxist view a consciously inherited tradition is a living tradition which forms the foundation of human knowledge. Socialist society inherits, develops and enriches such traditions, being a society in which the revolutionary traditions of the Communist Party and the working class are predominant.

The Soviet Communist Party, founded by Lenin, has always acted "under the banner of a revolutionary Social-Democratic programme, which must maintain the continuity of the movement . . .".¹ Party programmes express and formalize the continuity of the revolutionary movement, of socialist and communist construction. As the Theses of the CC CPSU for the 50th Anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution emphasized: "The three Party programmes, each corresponding to the most important historical stages in the development of socialism, are a concentrated expression of the Party's revolutionary thought and revolutionary practice."²

Lenin attached paramount importance to maintaining and adding to "all the traditions of Bolshevism".³ The maintenance of traditions is a form of assimilating the available revolutionary experience, a form of its prac-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Draft of a Declaration of the Editorial Board of *Iskra* and *Zarya*", *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 322.

² *Fiftieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Theses of the CC CPSU*, Moscow, 1970, p. 41.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Those Who Would Liquidate Us", *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 81.

tical application in the context of a new historical situation marked by changed social circumstances. The maintenance of continuity and preservation of traditions is a creative effort which has nothing to do with simplistic copying of what has gone before. To preserve and carry on a tradition is to develop it in a creative spirit. Lenin emphasized: "It is one thing to preserve the traditions of the revolution, to know how to use them for constant propaganda and agitation and for acquainting the masses with the conditions of a direct and aggressive struggle against the old regime, but quite another thing to repeat a slogan divorced from the sum total of the condition which gave rise to it and which ensured its success and to apply it to essentially different conditions."¹ Therefore, it is so important to be able to take into account and to grasp a new socio-economic and political situation, to allow for the impact of changed conditions.

The question of traditions and continuity is by no means an historical abstraction. It has retained its relevance since understanding of the past and the present, and gaining a vision of the shape of things to come are always intrinsically interdependent. This question has today taken on an added urgency because the scientific and technological revolution and rising living standards have combined to confer a quite practical significance on the blend of material and spiritual values in the life of millions of people. This problem has a direct bearing on the status of the intelligentsia who are directly involved in spiritual production which is something that prompts them to show growing interest in the history of the spiritual life of the people. Wherever and whenever research and study in this field are conducted on the basis of well-defined Marxist-Leninist guidelines and clear social criteria, they yield good results which contribute the best of the culture of the past to the socialist culture of today.

The nihilistic slogan of indiscriminate and sweeping renunciation of the past is countered not by omnivorousness with respect to all that has been (such extremes

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Against Boycott", *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 39-40.

usually represent the reverse side of the coin) but rather the Leninist principle of mastering the entire spiritual wealth accumulated by mankind in the course of recorded history, the development of the best examples and traditions of the past from the standpoint of the proletariat's outlook. The very approach to the heritage of the past and to what should be borrowed from it and developed further is determined by a world outlook.

There is one other special feature to this problem. The historical past, the history of culture, the language, apart from their rational content, affect the emotional sphere directly, especially the national sentiments of people. Lenin stressed: "International culture is not non-national."¹ It would be wrong to overlook this circumstance which exerts substantial influence on the way these problems are perceived in the mass consciousness. While nations exist, national sentiments of people will continue to exist in one form or another as well. As Leonid Brezhnev pointed out when the New Soviet Constitution was being adopted: "The Soviet people's social and political unity does not at all imply the disappearance of national distinctions."²

In the USSR the national question has been solved completely and irrevocably in the sense in which it existed in tsarist Russia where the social oppression by the exploiting classes was made worse by national oppression. At present a new historical community of people—the Soviet people—has been formalized in the Soviet Constitution. This does not mean, of course, that in terms of the development of national relations Soviet society is now problem-free. Leonid Brezhnev stated: "There are also objective problems in our federal state, such as finding the correct ways of developing the individual nations and nationalities and the most correct balance between the interests of each nation and nationality and the common interest of the Soviet people as a whole."³ Hence the fundamental importance, from the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 24.

² L. I. Brezhnev, *On the Draft Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Results of the Nationwide Discussion of the Draft*, Moscow, 1977, p. 15.

³ L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course*, Moscow, 1975, p. 76.

ideological and political-educational viewpoint, of a consistent internationalist approach to all problems bearing on the development of national relations.

Any departure from the internationalist position on this matter may result in aberrations into nationalist narrow-mindedness, arrogance and pretensions to "exclusiveness". The causes of these negative phenomena and aberrations are rooted, doubtless, both in narrow-mindedness and in subjectivist sentiments and nationalist prejudices which have not yet been completely overcome and which are being stimulated by anti-Soviet propaganda from abroad.

For Marxists it has always been axiomatic that national sentiments are a multi-dimensional, complex issue with rational and emotional aspects to it. It is wrong to ignore them but it is equally wrong to flirt with them since any such flirtation results in national sentiments acquiring a nationalistic colouring. It is all the more inadmissible to do so when national sentiments are arbitrarily narrowed down and lose their social content, when they are deliberately or unwittingly opposed to the socialist essence of Soviet patriotism, to the Leninist understanding of the working man's national pride.

The source of the patriotic pride of a Soviet man is the socialist accomplishments of the Soviet people, their revolutionary, democratic and progressive traditions. In the cultural heritage of the past the Marxists single out its socialist, democratic and progressive elements, genuine spiritual values, and condemn everything that was reactionary, that served the purpose of subjugating working people by the exploiting classes, of disuniting them along ethnic and nationalist lines. That which is socialist and internationalist is truly patriotic while in the context in the past it is that which is revolutionary, democratic and progressive, which enriches the Soviet culture of today with genuine spiritual values.

The national question today is the scene of a sharp ideological and political confrontation between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism. The struggle against nationalistic tendencies is a component part of the international struggle against bourgeois ideology. Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism are not only two opposite policies but they are two po-

larized world outlooks. The Communists have an effective and tested weapon against nationalistic tendencies of any kind, from whatever quarter they may come. The Communists of a big nation should be the first to oppose all chauvinistic manifestations while the Communists of a small nation should combat nationalistic trends, nationalistic narrow-mindedness and egoism. Lenin taught that the Communists should present a united front against any nationalistic manifestations and combat them from the common positions of proletarian internationalism. Nationalism can be successfully countered only by internationalism.

Lenin repeatedly emphasized that the crux of the matter is "to be able to be an internationalist in deed",¹ to be able to "fight *against* small-nation narrow-mindedness, seclusion and isolation, consider the whole and the general, subordinate the particular to the general interest".²

The problems of patriotic and internationalist education of the masses were examined in detail by the 25th Congress of the CPSU which generalized the wealth of experience gained by Party organizations across the country in this important field of the ideological and educational work in recent years, and outlined the tasks facing the Party in this sphere in the immediate future. Of fundamental importance was the proposition outlined in the Report of the CC CPSU to the Congress on an indissoluble unity between patriotic education of the masses and their internationalistic education. These are two inalienable aspects of a single problem which can be solved in this indissoluble unity only.

Under developed socialism the role and significance of cultural and spiritual factors of human life grow, and society is increasingly interested in a wider diversity and richness of culture, in the profound assimilation of its values by all members of society. The scientific and technological revolution, the rapid expansion and improvement of the material and technical facilities for their part combine to create new and better technologi-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 82.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up", *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 347.

cal conditions for spiritual production, conditions in many respects unique and unprecedented. Clearly, the social effects of the scientific and technological revolution in the sphere of spiritual production also undergo fundamental change and are modified in different socio-economic and social structures as they are in other areas of the life of modern society.

The experience of existing socialism has borne out the entire fruitfulness of Lenin's approach to the sphere of culture, that most complex and delicate sphere of social activity. Lenin saw the historic role of the working class as the builder of the new society in the fact that, as he put it, "from now on all the marvels of science and the gains of culture belong to the nation as a whole and never again will man's brain and human genius be used for oppression and exploitation".¹

Lenin attached great attention to the practical preparation of the working class for accomplishing this historic mission. In his *What Is To Be Done?* Lenin outlined a broad programme of political education for the workers to enable them to gain a sound knowledge of their time. He wrote: "... In order that working men may succeed in this more often, every effort must be made to raise the level of the consciousness of the workers in general; it is necessary that the workers do not confine themselves to the artificially restricted limits of 'literature for workers' but that they learn to an increasing degree to master general literature."²

After the winning of political power by the working class and the nationalization of the basic means of production Lenin considered it important that "cultural revolution would now suffice to make our country a completely socialist country".³

Lenin's programme of cultural revolution was an outstanding contribution to the theory and practice of scientific communism. The highlights of the programme in-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Third All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 481-82.

² V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 384.

³ V. I. Lenin, "On Co-operation", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 475.

cluded elimination of illiteracy and the development of public education as an indispensable condition for the introduction of the broadest masses of working people to politics and culture. Lenin wrote: "So long as there is such a thing as illiteracy in our country it is too much to talk about political education. This is not a political problem; it is a condition without which it is useless talking about politics. An illiterate person stands outside politics, he must first learn his ABC."¹ Hence the need for linking ideological and political education with cultural and educational work. This does not mean that the problem of linking cultural and educational work with political education is no longer relevant once illiteracy has been eliminated. On the contrary, this task is not a passing phase but a constant effort which is reproduced in a new form at every successive stage of social development. Now that the USSR has built a society of fully developed socialism, the CPSU is tackling questions of ideological and educational work in an organic unity with the tasks of further developing public education and promoting cultural life, and of enhancing the country's cultural and spiritual potential across the board.

The higher the level of culture, the more comprehensive and balanced the development of the individual, the better are the conditions for tackling the tasks of political education and upbringing in a socialist society. At the same time, a high level of cultural and educational standards makes more exacting demands on the content, methods and forms of political education for the masses so that they correspond to the increased spiritual needs of the masses. The link between culture and political education, far from being static, is dialectical and multi-dimensional.

Whereas the elimination of spiritual impoverishment is the arithmetic of a cultural revolution, its algebra lies in the victory of the socialist ideology in the public mind, in overcoming petty-bourgeois attitudes and traditions, in organizing the entire spiritual life of society

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The New Economic Policy and The Tasks of the Political Education Departments", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 78.

along socialist lines and in its constant enrichment and diversification.

Lenin saw the cultural revolution as a powerful constructive force capable of boosting social production, of creating a new social labour discipline, an instrument for introducing millions of working people to new forms of social life, to a practical participation in the running of affairs of state and society, for making them into conscious architects of a new way of life. Lenin conceived of the cultural revolution as a tool which would make it possible to tackle the difficult task of uniting experience and knowledge that had been gained by mankind with the independent activity of the masses, with their energy and drive.

Culture is an inalienable part of the entire social organization of the socialist society: production, daily life, human relations, the moulding and education of the new man. Cultural achievements constitute not only society's spiritual but also its practical wealth. Lenin pointed out that to improve the country's economic performance "we must raise culture to a much higher level".¹ As the country's national economy becomes more diversified and complex, as the scale and qualitative characteristics of economic progress constantly expand there is growing need for expanding and diversifying cultural activities which have a growing feedback effect on the country's production sphere, on labour productivity and on the quality of production and economic performance at all levels.

Lenin attached fundamental importance to the leadership of the Communist Party in the spiritual life under socialism, in cultural development. He attached great importance to the Communist Party's guiding role in implementing consistently Marxist ideological principles in literature and art, to skillfully applying these principles to this highly specific form of social life. Spiritual life cannot be allowed to run its own course as the fancy takes it. It is important to shape the end results of spiritual production well in advance and according to plan, to develop specific methods of guidance based on

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

an intimate knowledge of the intrinsic laws governing spiritual and cultural development, including a good understanding of the social and professional specific characteristics of the intelligentsia.

Substantiating their class-oriented approach to an analysis and evaluation of social events and phenomena Marx, Engels and Lenin forged its cardinal methodological principles in a tough struggle against all manner of vulgarizers who had dabbled in Marxism and assimilated it only one-sidedly. The Marxian proposition on the essential connection between a class and its men of letters was applied to a specific analysis of a variety of phenomena including works of literature and art, and this yielded valuable results which showed the meaning of the Marxist approach in action, in its practical application to various areas of human endeavour.

The vulgarization of the Marxist social criteria is particularly intolerable in an analysis and evaluation of the most delicate aspects of spiritual life and that is why Engels's polemic with the so-called "young Social-Democrats" in Germany at the end of last century—P. Ernest, P. Kampffmeyer and G. Müller—has retained its relevance to this day. These, as Engels described them with caustic wit, "most wise doctors and toffy-nosed literateurs", were, in fact, shopkeepers in terms of their mentality and psychology in the sphere of letters and literary criticism. Opportunists politically and semi-literate "Marxists" in theoretical terms, they were hard at work peddling their vulgarized simplistic views which had nothing to do with Marxism. Engels was faced with the task of distancing himself from such characters since they were using the Party's banner to disguise themselves with and used Marxist terminology ever so glibly.

Engels proved equal to the challenge. He wrote: "On the theoretical side I discovered in it (i.e. in the theoretical and practical activity of the opposition—N. B.)... a 'Marxism' distorted out of all recognition, a Marxism that was noted, firstly, for an obvious failure to understand the world outlook for which they pretended to speak, secondly, for complete ignorance of historical facts of decisive importance at each juncture of history, and thirdly, for a clear, pronounced aware-

ness of their own boundless superiority, which is so much a feature of a German literateur."¹

This "obvious failure to understand" and "complete ignorance" was demonstrated by them in their discourses on Ibsen and Strindberg. Having replaced the revolutionary-critical method of Marxism with a set of dogmatic axioms, they failed to give a sound social analysis of the work of these outstanding Norwegian writers and remained stuck in the middle of the vulgar-sociological morass of speculative judgements.

To P. Ernest the work of Ibsen is "the dialectics of a philistine—a kitten chasing its own tail". But it turned out that P. Ernest himself proved to be the "kitten" for, having imputed to the great writer cowardliness, opportunism and other similar qualities, Ernest actually painted his own self-portrait, that of a typical representative of the German petty bourgeoisie of the late 19th century. Engels exposed the full methodological futility of Ernest's arguments which were devoid of real social criteria, historicism and a good knowledge of the subject about which he wrote with a rare degree of shallowness and pretention. Engels's line of attack on Ernest was highly edifying. First of all Engels noted that it was inadmissible to identify the concrete historical conditions surrounding the German and the Norwegian petty bourgeoisie, that it was inadmissible to ignore the democratic nature of the latter. In Germany philistinism was "the outcome of a shipwrecked revolution" while the Norwegian bourgeois democrat was "the son of a free peasant and under these circumstances is a *man* in comparison with the debased German philistine".² Replying to the ill-starred "critic" Engels wrote: "You put all Norway and everything that happens there into one category: philistinism, and then you unhesitatingly attribute to this Norwegian philistinism the qualities which in your opinion distinguish *German* philistinism."³

¹ Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 22, S. 66.

Awareness of one's own boundless superiority implies the pretentiousness of petty-bourgeois consciousness, something Marx and Engels repeatedly referred to.

² "Engels to Paul Ernest in Berlin, London, June 5, 1890". In: Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 391-92.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 391.

After demonstrating the contradictory nature of Ibsen's work which was a conglomerate of the strong and weak points of the great writer's outlook and perception of the world, Engels concluded: "And whatever the shortcomings of, for instance, Ibsen's plays may be they mirror, it is true, a world of the small and medium bourgeoisie and there is an enormous difference between it and the position in Germany, they mirror a world in which people still have strength of character and initiative and act independently, even though according to the concepts prevalent in other countries their actions may often seem odd. I prefer to make a thorough study of such things before making a final judgement."¹

Speaking of the class approach to literature and art Engels showed that nothing could do more harm in this area than a simplistic approach, oversimplification and failure to understand the specific nature of the subject in question which should be submitted to a close and careful scrutiny. It is not only and not so much a matter of the writer's class origins or his subjective sympathies and antipathies. There have been many examples in the history of world literature and art when the sympathies and antipathies of great artists clashed with the objective content and message of their works. Engels wrote: "That Balzac... was compelled to go against his own class sympathies and political prejudices, that he *saw* the necessity of the downfall of his favourite nobles, and described them as people deserving no better fate; and that he *saw* the real men of the future where, for the time being, they alone were to be found—that I consider one of the greatest triumphs of realism and one of the grandest features in old Balzac."²

Engels's brilliant analysis of the work of Balzac and Lenin's of Tolstoy's are remarkable examples and lessons of the Marxist social analysis of the spiritual life of society which demonstrated its entire fruitfulness, strict scientific soundness and consistent Party approach applied to so complex an area of human endeavour.

Lenin examined the importance of the work of Lev Tolstoy as a writer, philosopher and preacher, through

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 392.

² "Engels to Margaret Harkness, April 1888". In: Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, p. 381.

the prism of the principal conflicts and contradictions of the era, from the angle of the international significance of the first Russian revolution. Lenin concluded that "the contradictions in Tolstoy's views are not contradictions inherent in his personal views alone, but are a reflection of the extremely complex, contradictory conditions, social influences and historical traditions which determined the psychology of various classes and various sections of Russian society in the *post-Reform*, but *pre-revolutionary* era".¹

Lenin developed his position on cultural questions in the course of his highly principled and uncompromising struggle against the anti-Marxist petty-bourgeois concept of the Trotskyites, right-wing opportunists, against "communist arrogance" and attempts to settle problems in the field of culture and literature by means of issuing fiat and edicts.

It should be noted that the anti-Party, anti-socialist views of the Trotskyites on cultural issues which they attempted to impose on the Communist Party in the 1902s—early 1930s, their insulting distrust and pathological suspicion of the intelligentsia were the inevitable result of their defeatist lack of faith in the creative powers of the working class, in its ability to direct the country's cultural and spiritual life. They were the result of a crude distortion of the substance and constructive tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the result of persistent attempts to provoke a clash between the working class on the one hand and the working peasantry and the intelligentsia on the other. The left- and right-wing capitulationists tried to impose on the Party petty-bourgeois views of revolution and socialism. Lenin wrote: "It is typical of the petty-bourgeois revolutionary not to notice that routing, putting down, etc., is not enough for socialism. It is sufficient for a small proprietor enraged against a big proprietor. But no proletarian revolutionary would ever fall into such error."²

Lenin, back in the early 1920s, gave a resounding rebuff to the crude distortion of the tasks of the proletarian

dictatorship by the Trotskyites, who attempted to put the working class and the peasantry and the intelligentsia on a collision course. Lenin showed that revolutionary violence and dictatorship can yield positive results when used "...in the right way and against the right people".¹ Violence worship, the desire to settle cultural and scientific issues by means of violence were rightly qualified by Lenin as foolish.² "Earlier revolutions perished because the workers were unable to retain power by means of a firm dictatorship and did not realise that they could not retain power by dictatorship, by force, by coercion alone."³ To consolidate the victory of the proletarian revolution and build a socialist society and subsequently prepare the ground for an advance to communism, the working class, all working people had to master the entire wealth of material and spiritual culture available at the time, to "take all its science, technology, knowledge and art".⁴

Lenin saw the problem of culture in all its gigantic theoretical scale and in all its enormous practical difficulty of tackling. In 1922 Lenin, drafting a political report to the 11th Congress of the Party, described the situation prevailing at the time: "'The key feature of the moment' (the link in the chain)=the gap between the grandeur of the tasks imposed and our *poverty*, not only material but also *cultural*."⁵ To close this gap was the most formidable challenge facing the Party at the time. The Party met this challenge.

Translating into reality Lenin's programme of the cultural revolution the Communist Party was guided throughout by Lenin's principles and instructions of the effect that the spiritual life of a socialist society is an inalienable part of the common cause of the Party and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of R.C.P.(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 162.

² See V. I. Lenin, "The Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 72.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at the Third All-Russia Congress of Water-Transport Workers", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 429-30.

⁴ V. I. Lenin, "The Achievements and Difficulties of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 70.

⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Notes for a Speech on March 27, 1922", *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, p. 574.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "L. N. Tolstoy", *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 325.

² V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing Childishness and Petty-Bourgeois Mentality", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 334.

the proletariat, that "nothing will be achieved in this by doing things in a rush, by assault", that "in matters of culture, haste and sweeping measures are most harmful".¹ No other qualities can in this area replace competence, professionalism, moral authority, talent and versatility. It would not be an exaggeration to say that perhaps in no other area is there greater need for a principled and tactful attitude, for a blend of exactingness and care not to hurt the feelings of others, careful analysis, weighing of all pros and cons, careful consideration of all possible consequences, for a profound scientific knowledge and unfailing political intuition, as there is in the sphere of intellectual and spiritual life.

In the light of the increasing role and significance of spiritual factors in a society of developed socialism the CPSU has been consistently implementing and developing Lenin's principles of Party leadership in the spiritual and cultural sphere of society. A truly Leninist style of leadership in this area based on a profound understanding of the specificity of spiritual life is the only adequate style of leadership corresponding to the intrinsic content of culture.

The culture of socialism is a worthy heir to everything that is of true value and enduring quality that has been created by preceding generations. It is a culture which fertilizes the great triumphs of the human genius with the living experience of socialism, with the revolutionary creativity of working people embarked on the building of the new society, it is a culture that maintains a constant interaction between the experience of the past and that of the present. Profoundly democratic in character and socialist in substance, internationalist in spirit and national in form, socialist culture represents a major step forward in the spiritual progress of mankind.

5. The Struggle of Ideologies and International Detente

The ideological aspects of life in Soviet society are closely associated with a variety of international factors,

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 487; see also pp. 488-89.

with the significant changes that have occurred in recent years on the international scene and which now characterize the new situation where the struggle of polarized ideas in the world is proceeding today. From the standpoint of world development a major step has been taken in the historic turn from confrontation to detente, a turn that was carefully analyzed by the 25th Congress of the CPSU.

The main report made to the Congress by Leonid Brezhnev contained a comprehensive theoretical analysis of such key ideological and political problems of today as the internationalist character of Marxism-Leninism, the class and humane character of the socialist foreign policy, the economic, political and ideological aspects of detente, peaceful coexistence and class struggle, and the unique features of the ideological confrontation in today's world. Leonid Brezhnev emphasized: "The positive changes in world affairs and the detente create favourable opportunities for the broad spread of socialist ideas. But, on the other hand, the ideological contest between the two systems is becoming ever more acute and imperialist propaganda ever more subtle."¹

International detente is a complex and contradictory process which develops amid the confrontation of positive and negative trends and factors on the world scene. Therefore it is the militant, class and humanistic task of socialist propaganda to wage a principled and resolute struggle against the intrigues of the enemies of peace, to give a resolute rebuff to imperialism's ideological subversion, to expose the provocations engineered by those who are trying to set the clock back to the times of the cold war, who are sowing seeds of hostility and mistrust among nations.

A characteristic concomitant of the cold war in the field of ideology is the notorious psychological warfare. The notion of "cold war" was introduced into the political vocabulary by American journalists and sociologists in 1946-47.

It is typical of bourgeois sociology and propaganda to try and bring closer together and even identify the notions of cold war and ideological struggle which in fact

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 89.

are different socio-political phenomena with different backgrounds. Whereas ideological struggle is the result of the split of society and of the world into two polarized social camps, the cold war is a specific phenomenon which was brought about above all by aggressive imperialist policy aimed at whipping up world tensions and creating conflict situations on the brink of war. Psychological warfare, ideological subversion and provocations launched against socialist countries serve the same purpose.

The spread throughout the world of the principles of peaceful coexistence does not imply that the opposition of socialism and capitalism disappears, that differences between the bourgeois and communist world outlook vanish. At the same time, the Communists, by virtue of their convictions, are dedicated champions of peace among nations.

Ideological differences and distinctions in the way of life cannot be obstacles to peaceful co-operation between states with different social systems. The war of ideas should be conducted on the basis of an open dialogue and comparison of ideological and philosophical principles rather than by means of subversion and provocations which is what imperialist propaganda has been staking upon.

The impossibility of compromises and of convergence of polarized positions, views and attitudes in the ideological sphere springs from its intrinsic and objective nature. The important distinction of ideology from politics lies in the fact that no meaningful political activity is possible without mutual concessions and compromises. Not so in ideology, where the slightest concession, any compromise lead to an erosion of positions of principle for the simple reason that in ideology there is no such thing as "minor matters". Essentially ideology represents a closely integrated body of views. And since ideology expresses the vital political principles of a specific class it marks the limit of how far one may go in making concessions and arriving at compromises in the political sphere. If concessions and compromises affect the ideological sphere it is a sure sign that the basic political interests and principles of the class are being revised or modified.

In politics, unlike ideology, compromises and concessions (on secondary issues, needless to say) do not lead to a change in the class nature of a particular political line. The rejection of compromises in politics is the hallmark of the "left-wingers" of every hue and stripe, and in practice it has always resulted in a departure from the truly principled policy of the working class since no meaningful political activity can be carried on along straight lines.

While politics covers a very wide area of social events and phenomena and encompasses distinctions between matters of primary and secondary importance, between permanent and temporary factors, ideology represents the thinking of a class in terms of a programme, it is a definitive system of views which reflect the basic interests of the class, its position within the system of social relations. It is from the viewpoint of these theoretical principles that events and phenomena are evaluated and a definite political class-oriented line is developed. These significant distinctions between the political and ideological activity were clearly defined by Lenin when he wrote that

1) no policy can be implemented without compromises, but "there are different kinds of compromises. One must be able to analyse the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each variety of compromise";¹

2) "no practical alliances ... can, or should, lead to compromises and concessions on matters of theory, programme or banner."²

In strict accordance with their theoretical principles the Communists have never confused the cold war with ideological struggle. The former came about as the result of the aggressive intrigues of the most reactionary imperialist circles and characterized a particular historical situation, a passing phase. The struggle between bourgeois and socialist ideas reflects the polarized nature of the interests of the two principal classes of modern society—the bourgeoisie and the working class. The war

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing' Communism—an Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 38.

² V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 331.

of ideas is an inevitable concomitant of the objective course of history when two opposite social forces and systems are locked in confrontation nationally and internationally.

Since the birth of the workers' movement class struggle has been waged according to plan in three directions—theoretically, politically, and in the practical economic sense. Lenin emphasized that Marxism "...recognises, *not two* forms of the great struggle of Social-Democracy (political and economic)... *but three, placing the theoretical struggle on a par with the first two*".¹

Ideological struggle today is raging on a broad front, around all the key problems of our time, amid rapidly changing conditions. As the 25th Congress of the CPSU stated, "problems of the ideological struggle are acquiring ever greater prominence, and the truth about socialism is a mighty weapon in this struggle".² Socialist ideology is a scientific world outlook which enables its adherents to conduct the struggle purposefully and with imagination relying on the full arsenal of sound scientific arguments and unassailable facts.

Socialist ideology tells the world the truth about the Soviet way of life, about socialism's great accomplishments, about the scale of moral values developed by the new society which asserts the most humanistic of ideals. Interest in the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, in the socialist way of life and its spiritual make-up is growing throughout the world.

The recent positive changes in world affairs coupled with international detente create favourable opportunities for the further spread of the ideas of socialism. One should bear in mind however, that years of cold war and frenzied anti-Soviet propaganda have left an imprint on the minds of various population groups in capitalist countries in the shape of all manner of prejudices and misconceptions about socialism, the Soviet way of life and communist ideals.

The opponents of international detente often claim that socialist ideology and socialism as a system alled-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What Is To Be Done?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 370.

² *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 13.

gedly inhibit international cultural exchanges. This is not true.

Marxism as a revolutionary doctrine, and Lenin repeatedly emphasized this, did not emerge away from the mainstream of world civilization. Marxism-Leninism has nothing to do with sectarianism. The Communists have always respected and preserved the wealth of spiritual values created by mankind. They have always advocated exchanges of genuine cultural values, of any exchanges that contribute to the spiritual development of men, to the cause of peace and friendship among nations. Cultural co-operation serves this humanist aim when it is based on the unswerving observance of the laws, standards and traditions in force in the participating countries. However, certain quarters in the West seek to exploit the slogan of "free exchange of ideas, people and information" for purposes that have nothing to do with genuine cultural co-operation and everything to do with reviving slanderous inventions about socialism borrowed from the rather worn out arsenal of the cold warriors. Understandably, any attempt of ideological interference by anti-communist propaganda in the life of socialist countries, any attempt to impose bourgeois view and morality by exploiting the dishonest interpretation of the letter and spirit of international agreements, has been and will continue to be resolutely rebuffed.

In conditions of the present-day ideological confrontation bourgeois and revisionist ideologists have stepped up their attacks on Marxism-Leninism as an international doctrine, on existing socialism and the leading role of the Communist Parties. Bourgeois propaganda has launched all manner of right-wing revisionist and leftist concepts, technocratic theories and much-publicized forecasts of "a crisis" of socialism and of the communist movement, exploiting at the same time the criticism of the personality cult and of a series of subjectivist mistakes that had been committed and giving top billing to a handful of outcasts and turncoats from socialist countries who politically represent nothing and no one.

It should be noted that the realistically thinking Western sociologists and politicians are aware of that. As L. Freund put it, "There is unfortunately no point of

departure for advancing the hypothesis about the disintegration of communist theory. There is no such point either in the field of domestic politics or in the foreign policy field.... Communist theory is not in a state which could be considered as indicating a retreat let alone a disintegration.”¹

Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois critics of scientific socialism are particularly at pains to sell their anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist concepts of “socialism”, to replace the “monistic”, i.e., Marxist-Leninist, doctrine of socialism with what they call “the pluralistic model”.² The meaning of this “theoretical” exercise is to adapt socialism to the interests of particular nationalist petty-bourgeois strata or groups, to exploit their weaknesses or prejudices to pave the way for the imposition of barracks-bureaucratic or bourgeois system of government.

Scientific socialism is synonymous with socialist ideology. This alone indicates the great importance of the doctrine of socialist society, of its substance and ways of building it, of its principles and basic laws governing its evolution. The question of socialism, the pivotal question of our time, is at the centre of the present-day ideological struggle. A large group of countries have now embarked on the socialist path. Many other countries have taken a non-capitalist path of development; they feature different levels of economic development and are building new societies amid widely differing historical, economic and political circumstances. The mass social basis of the struggle for socialism has greatly expanded and now includes wide sections of the working people including a variety of non-proletarian strata. They all see socialism as the embodiment of their principal aspirations and vital interests.

At the same time, the complexities involved in the effort to build the new society, the wide diversity of conditions of life and the actual levels of consciousness of the people participating in socialist construction, the misconceptions, habits and prejudices that have been shaped by centuries, the limited nature of the social and

political experience of particular strata and groups and the impact of subtle bourgeois propaganda combine to create certain difficulties impeding the tackling of the positive task of socialist construction. The leftist and rightist deviations and departures from the theory and practice of scientific socialism are a typical petty-bourgeois reaction to these difficulties.

For Communists such social deformations are nothing new, however bizarre and grotesque the shape these deformations may assume today. It is common knowledge that scientific socialism established itself in the course of uncompromising struggle against all manner of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois, pseudo-socialist concepts. Marx and Engels in their day fought against them, later Lenin, and now all Communists in the true Leninist tradition. As Leonid Brezhnev emphasized in his speech at the 25th Congress of the CPSU: “Doubly so, because both Right and ultra-Left revisionism is by no means idle, and struggle for the Marxist-Leninist principles of the communist movement and against attempts to distort or undermine them is still the common task of all.”¹

Soviet Communists have been consistently adhering to the Marxist-Leninist principles and drawing on the theoretical heritage bequeathed by Lenin.

Lenin wrote: “We take our stand entirely on the Marxist theoretical position: Marxism was the first to transform socialism from a utopia into a science, to lay a firm foundation for this science, and to indicate the path that must be followed in further developing and elaborating it in all its parts.”² Emphasizing the need for an imaginative approach to socialist construction depending on the actual circumstances surrounding it Lenin pointed out that the basic, cardinal principles of socialism have international relevance and implications. He wrote: “... The Russian model... reveals to *all* countries something—and something highly significant—of their near and inevitable future.”³

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 37.

² V. I. Lenin, “Our Programme”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 210.

³ V. I. Lenin, “‘Left-Wing’ Communism—An Infantile Disorder”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 22.

¹ L. Freund, *Koexistenz und Entspannung. Hoffnung oder Gefahr?* Würzburg, 1976, p. 16.

² See *Scientific Communism and Its Renegade Falsifiers*, Moscow, 1974 (in Russian).

Leonid Brezhnev in his report "The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress", on the basis of the 60 year record of socialist construction in the USSR and the aggregate experience of world socialism and the historic lessons it has taught, provided a comprehensive in-depth analysis of the general, cardinal features of socialist revolution and socialist construction. In the words of the report:

"The question of power continues to be main issue in a revolution. It is either the power of the working class, acting in alliance with all the working people, or the power of the bourgeoisie. There is no third possibility;

"transition to socialism is possible only if the working class and its allies, having gained real political power, use it to end the socio-economic domination of capitalist and other exploiters;

"socialism can be victorious only if the working class and its vanguard, the Communists, are able to inspire and unite the working people as a whole in the struggle to build the new society, to transform the economy and all social relations along socialist lines;

"socialism can consolidate its position only if the working people's power is capable of defending the revolution against any attacks by the class enemy (and such attacks are inevitable, both internal and, most of all, external)." ¹

Marxist-Leninist theory and the record to date indicate that socialism cannot be based on heterogeneous economic, socio-political and ideological principles and that all attempts to "fuse" socialism with nationalism or with bourgeois-liberal "freedoms" or with military-bureaucratic systems of administration are doomed to failure.

The permanent methodological value of Lenin's analysis, of his approach to problems of revolutionary practice resides in the fact that it is aimed at identifying elements of universal, international relevance in particular, individual instances and examples. Marxism-Leninism uses the prism of international experience, of the principal contradictions of a particular period and its dominant features to look at the rich diversity of concrete, specific

circumstances and conditions in which general laws governing the development of the socialist revolution and socialist construction find many different forms of manifestation and application.

Of great importance in the current ideological struggle are the ideological and moral resources at the disposal of the two polarized social systems.

This ideological struggle reflects the moral and political status of society each of the confronting ideologies represents. The 25th Congress of the CPSU provided a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of the crisis that has hit modern capitalism across the board including its spiritual sphere. Leonid Brezhnev emphasized: "The politico-ideological crisis of bourgeois society is more acute. It afflicts the institutions of power and bourgeois political parties, and undermines elementary ethical standards. Corruption is increasingly open, even in the top echelons of the state machinery. The decline of intellectual culture continues, and the crime rate is rising.

"It is farthest from the Communists' minds to predict an 'automatic collapse' of capitalism. It still has considerable reserves. Yet the developments of recent years forcefully confirm that capitalism is a society without a future." ¹

Revisionist critics are trying to find a contradiction between two Marxist positions—one on the crisis of bourgeois ideology and the other according to which any diminution, belittling of the role of socialist ideology is tantamount to allowing bourgeois ideology to gain strength. The revisionists have always had a simplistic idea of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the general crisis of capitalism, including the crisis of bourgeois ideology.

It is important to remember that bourgeois ideology despite the deep crisis it is undergoing, will not depart from the stage of history of its own free will and it would be wrong to underestimate its harmful influence and danger even when in deep crisis.

The fundamental importance of the Leninist approach to the world-historical scale of the measurement of the historical process and practical politics is essential for

¹ L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, Moscow, 1977, p. 19.

¹ *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU*, p. 34.

a correct understanding of this question. In criticizing the leftists who had failed to understand the dialectics of the world-historical and practical-political approach to social affairs Lenin wrote: "Parliamentarianism has become 'historically obsolete'. That is true in the propaganda sense. However, everybody knows that this is still a far cry from overcoming it in *practice*. Capitalism could have been declared—and with full justice—to be 'historically obsolete' many decades ago, but that does not at all remove the need for a very long and very persistent struggle *on the basis* of capitalism. Parliamentarianism is 'historically obsolete' from the standpoint of *world history*, i.e., the *era* of bourgeois parliamentarianism is over, and the *era* of the proletarian dictatorship has *begun*. That is incontestable. But world history is counted in decades. Ten or twenty years earlier or later makes no difference when measured with the yardstick of world history; from the standpoint of world history it is a trifle that cannot be considered even approximately. But for that very reason, it is a glaring theoretical error to apply the yardstick of world history to practical politics."¹

The great value and importance of this conclusion by Lenin lies above all in the fact that it shows the inadmissibility in an analysis or assessment of social events of *confusing two aspects, two different approaches—world-historical and concrete-political*. Confusion of these two aspects is unsound from the theoretical standpoint as it leads to a loss of perspective and disorientation in the field of practical politics. This methodological principle which has the virtue of what we might call substantive universality, is entirely applicable to an analysis of today's bourgeois ideology.

The general crisis of capitalism has affected not only its economics and politics but its spiritual sphere as well, above all its ideology. Bourgeois ideology has lost the position of dominance it once had in the world for it is being successfully countered today by socialist ideology. Bourgeois ideology has no future just as the system whose spiritual spokesman it is, has no future to look forward to. Bourgeois ideology is becoming increas-

ingly impoverished in absolute and relative terms, as it is compelled to retreat before the pressure of socialist ideology, the ideology of the future. This is the overall situation measured on the time-scale of world history.

While we take fully into account this time-scale and historical perspective, we should not oversimplify in practical-political activity the substance and meaning of the current crisis of bourgeois ideology, its progressive impoverishment and degradation. The global crisis of the bourgeois forms of consciousness does not imply that bourgeois ideology has ceased to be a serious foe. Any underestimation of its harmful potential would be a gross mistake. Lenin, having given an in-depth analysis of the crisis of the bourgeois ideology, at the same time set the task of overcoming its ideological resistance which is "...the most deep-seated and the strongest".¹ The chequered record of ideological struggle on the international scene, the course of the present-day class confrontation in the sphere of ideology have borne out the accuracy and soundness of Lenin's conclusions and forecasts.

The intensifying state-monopoly trends in the spiritual life of capitalism have caused a reaction from the bourgeois strata of society, in the form of growing criticism by liberal-minded academics of today's forms of bourgeois propaganda. This criticism by and large is still bourgeois in character. The liberal critics oppose the increasingly tighter controls being imposed on spiritual life by state-monopoly capitalism, they are against excesses and extremism. This criticism is remarkable in that it goes a long way to explain the critical remarks about bourgeois ideology and propaganda which abound in recent Western literature. Many of these critical remarks about the crisis of culture and morals, about the de-humanization of modern capitalism, about the omnipotence of the mass media, etc., have come from non-Marxists.

When evaluating the meaning of such criticism one should take into account, among other things, the competition on the bourgeois market of ideas which com-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Left-Wing' Communism—An Infantile Disorder", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 56.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Speech Delivered at an All-Russia Conference of Political Education Workers of Gubernia and Uyezd Education Departments", *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 370.

pels the contestants to resort to "self-criticism" and "to criticize" their rivals, in an attempt to show that this or that group would be in a position to express the interests of its class more fully and better, and to safeguard bourgeois society by means of reliable and flexible ideological weapons. The various bourgeois-liberal concepts that have sprouted on the soil of modern capitalist relations are geared to the same end. This soil has been intensively "fertilized" in recent decades by all manner of economic and social measures designed to stabilize the capitalist system in the face of deepening contradictions and conflicts, to exploit the fruits of the scientific and technological revolution in the interests of capitalism, to adapt to the rapidly changing international situation. Bourgeois ideology and bourgeois propaganda on which the monopolists spend enormous amounts of money, are geared to this goal.

One more circumstance deserves our attention. The inner workings, the concrete mechanism of control over spiritual life exercised by state-monopoly capitalism is still the least studied. The reason here is not only the intrinsic complexity of the subject of enquiry. The fact is that the actual mechanism for controlling the mass media, the artistic and scientific activities has been and remains the "holy of holies" for monopoly capital which keeps it a closely guarded secret.

Bourgeois ideology and propaganda, having been nurtured by a mystified bourgeois reality, both prey on it and exploit it. And manufacture of myths itself has been given a conceptual character by bourgeois ideology, it has been elevated into the status of a dominant doctrine which is being implemented consciously and in a carefully organized way at all levels and echelons of bourgeois propaganda. Paradoxically this is also its greatest weakness and the reason why it is doomed by history.

6. The Deepening of the Spiritual Crisis of Bourgeois Society and Its Ideology

Leninist principles of ideological activity, the concrete assessment of present-day democratic movements and the ideological trends which accompany them in

the sphere of social consciousness, the identification of different levels of political awareness and specific spiritual interests of various groups in the middle strata of modern bourgeois society are acquiring special importance today. The totality of these problems calls for the further active elaboration of the Marxist-Leninist methodology for gaining better knowledge of the spiritual life of society. This methodology is equally opposed to the narrow-minded approach of the doctrinaire and to ideological omnivorousness.

Polarized ideological principles are irreconcilable. There can be no concessions made in matters of theory, programme and banner—this is the clear-cut line followed by Communists and originally formulated by Lenin. The implementation of this line, the very understanding of the essence and specificity of the class confrontation in the spiritual sphere is the scene of struggle on two fronts—against the right-wingers and equally against the left-wing revisionism, both of whom falsify the substance of the issue.

Marxist critics have shown that right-wing revisionism is trying to extend principles of peaceful coexistence to the sphere of ideology in order to introduce foreign bodies into socialist consciousness and socialist ideology. Bourgeois ideologists understand well this role of right-wing revisionism. Thus, O. Lemberg in his book *Reformation in Communism?* ("Reformation" as used by the author presumably means revision—N. B.) stated bluntly that the meaning of new theoretical views is to oppose ideology and science and to deny the scientific character of Marxism as a philosophy. Lemberg claims that the new theoretical views expounded by modern revisionists create favourable conditions for an ideological convergence between the socialist and capitalist worlds and these conditions should be exploited by the West to the hilt.¹ At the same time, both right-wing and left-wing revisionists are at pains to work ideologically on the intellectual community in capitalist countries, to dish up Marxism and socialism to it with a petty-bourgeois slant to them. This close

¹ See O. Lemberg, *Reformation im Kommunismus?*, Stuttgart, 1967, pp. 45-46.

attention to the intellectual community is not a matter of chance.

The question of the ways of the social and spiritual development of intelligentsia has taken on a special urgency today when socialism indicates the realistic way of settling the most important and pressing problems of our time, when the class contradictions of capitalism have become aggravated and the world has entered the era of the scientific and technological revolution, all of which has brought about the need for rationalizing all aspects of social life, for making science an integral part of production and management.

The problems of science and culture and the historical future of humanism loom large in the struggle between bourgeois and socialist ideologies. The enemies of the working class are aware of this. Thus, the emergence of the concept of de-ideologization in bourgeois sociology was aimed at both foreign and internal policy. The architects of this concept took into account the progressive decline of bourgeois ideology and the public's growing distrust of various forms of bourgeois propaganda. Not surprisingly therefore the de-ideologization concept was camouflaged by its peddlers with references to prominent scientific authorities, to the "selfless, disinterested" nature of knowledge independent of class interest and alien to any propagandistic end. This line of arguing was designed to sway certain sections of the scientific and artistic community in the West who for a variety of reasons seek to retain their "ideological neutrality" and tend to hold themselves aloof from the burning social problems of our time.

The architects of the de-ideologization concept are also trying to create the impression that the great divide between the Marxists and the non-Marxists lies in the fact that the former advocate ideology and propaganda while the latter trust science and information more.

In a situation where Marxism-Leninism is gaining more prestige and influence, where the positive example of socialist countries is becoming more attractive to the rest of the world, bourgeois propaganda is attempting to insulate the intelligentsia from the advanced ideology of our time, to blacken the experience of ex-

isting socialism. Within the framework of efforts being made by bourgeois ideology to fulfil this social order, special functions have been assigned to right-wing revisionists who are passing themselves off for "creative Marxists". Those among the right-wing revisionists who specialize in matters of culture, literature and art are given special assignments. Right-wing revisionism is attempting to set up an "ideological cordon sanitaire" against scientific socialism by declaring that the intelligentsia are the only creative force in the world today and by exploiting to the full those moods and sentiments among a section of the intellectual community in advanced capitalist countries which spring not only from their specific social status but to a certain extent are attributable to a morbid reaction to the changes affecting the structure and principles of the organization of spiritual production, which have been brought about with the inevitability of an objective need by the scientific and technological revolution under capitalism.

For their part the left-wing revisionists camouflaging themselves with ultra-revolutionary sounding phraseology deny the revolutionary potential of the intelligentsia regarding it as a "reactionary bourgeois mass" without exception. The disastrous consequences of such anti-Marxist views and approaches have been repeatedly demonstrated by the most recent history.

The scientific resolution of the problem of the intelligentsia has been provided by Lenin who has assessed its social role and revolutionary potential in a profound fashion. According to Lenin, "petty-bourgeois democracy is not a chance political formation, not an exception, but a *necessary* product of capitalism. And it is not only the old, pre-capitalist, economically reactionary middle peasants who are the 'purveyors' of this democracy. So, too, are the co-operative societies with their capitalist training that have sprung from the soil of large-scale capitalism, the intellectuals, etc."¹ Lenin's theoretical legacy contains an analysis of the role and place of the intelligentsia within the social class

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Little Picture in Illustration of Big Problems", *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 389.

structure of bourgeois society, which makes it possible to reveal the special features of its social behaviour, consciousness and psychology. Lenin pointed out that "...the intelligentsia, as a special stratum of modern capitalist society, is characterised, by and large, *precisely by individualism* and incapacity for discipline and organisation.... This, incidentally, is a feature which unfavourably distinguishes this social stratum from the proletariat; it is one of the reasons for the flabbiness and instability of the intellectual, which the proletariat so often feels; and this trait of the intelligentsia is intimately bound up with its customary mode of life, its mode of earning a livelihood, which in a great many respects approximates to the *petty-bourgeois mode of existence*..."¹

It is important to single out three points in the above definition.

Firstly, Lenin speaks of the intelligentsia as of a definite social stratum of capitalist society. This should be emphasized since it would be wrong to extend a description of the socio-political qualities and socio-psychological properties of the intelligentsia as the petty-bourgeois stratum of capitalist society to the intelligentsia of a socialist society which, in alliance with the working class and the peasantry, under the leadership of the Communist Party, takes an active part in communist construction and contributes its weighty share to the common cause of the people.

Secondly, Lenin speaks of definite socio-psychological features, of the social portrait of the intelligentsia of bourgeois society in contrast with the working class.

And thirdly, Lenin speaks of the petty-bourgeois consciousness of the intelligentsia as of a special kind of consciousness which differs from the petty-bourgeois consciousness of the peasantry both in terms of origin and especially so, in terms of manifestation. These varieties of what is essentially the same petty-bourgeois consciousness are sufficiently different one from another and cannot be ignored or neglected.

The petty-bourgeois consciousness of the peasantry exists and gets reproduced in more conservative and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "One Step Forward, Two Steps Back", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 269.

less mobile and for this reason more "traditionalist" forms than the petty-bourgeois consciousness of the intelligentsia which exists and reproduces itself in forms which are noted for a greater degree of mobility, variability, a greater "criticism" and which produces on collision with the realities of bourgeois society the so-called "frustrated consciousness". Unfulfilled expectations result in deep social frustrations and tragic situations. This explains why the intelligentsia is so sensitive to social injustices and conflicts, why it is so acutely aware of the deep crisis of the human and moral values of bourgeois society, etc.

With certain qualifications it could be said that the petty-bourgeois consciousness of the peasantry realizes itself for the most part in the shape of prejudices while the petty-bourgeois consciousness of the intelligentsia—in the form of illusions.

We could also use the following comparison to illustrate the point: for the peasantry as a whole "ideological neutrality", social inertness, passivity to social problems are characteristic, and the main difficulty in educating the peasants ideologically and politically is to get the peasantry to show an active interest in social issues of importance. The intelligentsia, on the other hand, have always been an ideologically active stratum, reacting sensitively to all and every social changes no matter which class these would effect. Lenin emphasized the particular sensitivity and social responsiveness of democratically-minded intellectuals who are never indifferent to "the other man's troubles" when he wrote: "The intelligentsia ... most consciously, most resolutely and most accurately reflect and express the development of class interests and political groupings of society as a whole."¹

The founders of Marxism-Leninism, having disclosed the dual socio-economic nature of the middle strata of society, showed that this duality is refracted in their consciousness and psychology. This duality is matched by a duality of consciousness in which prejudices and rationality, illusions and a sense of reality are intricate-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Revolutionary Youth", *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 45.

ly intertwined. The key to a sound analysis of the problem lies in the demand made by Lenin to be able to separate in an analysis of such social phenomena opportunistic elements and trends from genuinely revolutionary and democratic ones.¹ This thesis is fully applicable to the intelligentsia. It is important therefore, according to Lenin, to identify not only the illusions but also the realities which are perceived in the minds of the intelligentsia and the impact of all socio-economic, political and spiritual factors of life in modern capitalist society. The impact of these factors is not monodimensional, nor is their refraction in the minds of the intellectuals.

The problems of the intelligentsia, of its social choice, of its attitude to reality, are indissolubly bound up with the historical destinies of humanism, since by nature of its professional activity it is directly involved in one form or another in the production of intellectual and spiritual values. Marx wrote that capitalism by its very nature is hostile to the basic areas of spiritual production carried on by the intellectuals. This hostility of capitalism has become more pronounced today now that the de-humanization of capitalist society has become universally acknowledged. The protests by progressive forces against the de-humanization of life in capitalist society are now a dominant motive of spiritual life in the West, one of the more graphic manifestations of the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly position of the democratic intelligentsia of capitalist countries.

It is an important principle of the Marxist analysis of human consciousness to see the layer of material relations behind the layer of ideological relations. This principle makes two interconnected but by no means interchangeable demands on the method of investigating ideological realities. To take into account these two demands is of fundamental theoretical and political importance. On the one hand, the special distinguishing features of the ideological consciousness of a particular social group have to be explained by the special features of its social position and the attitude of this

position to the dominant trends of social development. On the other hand, a complete analysis of the ideological consciousness under investigation calls for what might be called a reverse movement of thought. It is important to show how, through which ideological formulae and images not only limitations and contradictions of this social position are reflected, but also its potential for inclusion into the process of the revolutionary transformation of society. Only in this way can one hope to follow how the broad strata of the intellectual community of capitalist countries are ideologically moving towards Marxism-Leninism.

The intelligentsia reacts particularly sensitively to the growing de-humanization of capitalism. This de-humanization is nothing new for bourgeois society but never before has the crisis of moral values been as deep and acute as it is today.

State-monopoly capital is expanding the sphere of man's enslavement. Work, thoughts and emotions—more and more aspects of human life are now being sucked into the orbit of capitalist exploitation. The standardization and levelling out of human personalities, the progressive loss of purpose in work and the reduction of the fullness of human life to the narrow, ego-centric interests of consumption—these and other deformations are some of the ugly, anti-human creatures of the bourgeois world. Intellectuals are particularly painfully aware of this, since any kind of creative activity is inseparable from human individuality which leaves its unique stamp on human creativity.

The bourgeois way of life, based as it is on economic enslavement, social inequality and political oppression acts as a hostile and alien force. This realization prompts people to escape from the inhuman world, to withdraw into the shell of "inner emigration", to shut themselves off from the cruel reality of life. Thus, life and consciousness give rise to the problem of loneliness of man in the capitalist society, to the theme of escapism.

A lonely man in a hostile world—this is one of the prominent themes in Western literature, philosophy and sociology. It is the dominant theme of existentialist philosophy. However, in criticizing the spiritual defi-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Two Letters", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 288.

ciency of the bourgeois society, the existentialist interpretation of humanism distorts its underlying causes. The state of "anonymous mediocrity", "averageness", "loneliness" and "indifference" to man in today's bourgeois society is regarded by the existentialists as an absolute and natural consequence of human nature, as an inalienable attribute of life in a world of alienation. This interpretation is a complex issue and needs to be spelled out.

First of all, we have to give a definite answer to the question: What is it in the picture of today's capitalist society as recreated by an existentialist consciousness that has a real basis and what has been left out, distorted and exaggerated out of all proportion?

Capitalism as it develops gives rise and constantly reproduces two opposite tendencies which define in different ways human relations and the spiritual make-up of man in the bourgeois world.

The growing social inequality, the increasing bureaucratization of the principal spheres of social life, the capitalist application of the latest technologies, the ever growing spiritual oppression of man combine to produce standardized human personalities, a feeling of alienation of the individual from society. One manifestation of this tendency in the development of capitalism is the growth of the spontaneous forces of social development which increasingly act as an anonymous, hostile forces that mutilate and destroy human destinies. This cannot but produce the mood of despair and hopelessness, especially among members of the petty-bourgeois stratum. The domination of monopolies implies an all pervading and ever more overt suppression of all forms of independent action by the masses including the intelligentsia which, by virtue of its social and professional qualities, is particularly sensitive to the growing oppression of spiritual life by state-monopoly capital.

But this is only one aspect of the evolution of capitalist society. The other is the simultaneous growth and strengthening of the working class and democratic forces. Lenin wrote: "Capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular, turn democracy into an illusion—though at the same time capitalism ... aggravates

the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy."¹ This accounts for the growing importance of general democratic goals in the industrialized capitalist countries.

It is precisely the dialectically contradictory realization in the social position of the intelligentsia of these two objective trends which characterize the development of today's capitalist society, that explains both the special spiritually-practical attitude of the intelligentsia to the world around it, an attitude that is embodied in a system of specific images and symbols, and the Marxist-Leninist assessment of the social consciousness based on this system of images and ideological stimuli, which organically includes not only the statement of its non-Marxist character but also the identification of specific ways and means of drawing the intelligentsia into the mainstream of struggle by the working class for an enduring peace, genuine democracy and socialism.

The intensive de-humanization of the basic spheres of modern capitalism, and its deepening ideological and political crisis, are graphically in evidence in the spiritual and cultural sphere. All major works of contemporary Western literature are dominated by the idea that the world of social injustice and the bourgeois pursuit of profit is incompatible with true human values and is, in fact, their absolute negation. The desire to escape from the world of man's inhumanity to man, to oppose it by "non-participation" in the bourgeois establishment is a form of protest against the existing scheme of things. But this is the protest of a man who fails to see which social force does the oppressing and the enslaving. Hostility of the anonymous power of capital to the interest of the individual, the indifference of bureaucracy are seen by the escapist as "the hostility of life in general", as the human predicament.

Western authors in the socio-critical tradition have reflected in their books this aspect of life in bourgeois society. The dominant tenor of their books is humanistic, tragic and sad. They rail against the indifference

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Reply to P. Kievsky (Y. Pyatakov)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 24-25.

of bourgeois society to human destiny, against the trampling underfoot of the individual's rights and dignity, against the encroachments on his freedom. Herein lies the profound social message of these works which are anti-capitalist in character and which convey well the spiritual confusion of people who are threatened with being crushed by the capitalist juggernaut.

The strengths of democratic literature in the West are its criticism of capitalism and its ills and the respect these books proclaim for man. Their weaknesses are the illusions they create, and the absence of a positive programme of social action.

Personal intellectual integrity and honesty in the absence of a clear-cut positive world outlook cannot guarantee a correct choice of position and attitude in complex historical situations when personal adherence to the Ten Commandments is not enough for a dynamic social action to change the world along revolutionary lines. Abstract humanism has all the hallmarks of social "defencism", of social scepticism, which springs from its overall world outlook. This outlook allows it to see in history only the "executioners" and their "victims" and makes it oppose everything either with "total rejection" or with "the courage of personal non-participation".

Lenin emphasized that a particular idea "...springs from, and can affect, a certain social environment, and is not the invention of some crackpot".¹ The work of Albert Camus is highly indicative and symptomatic in this context. One of the most prominent and important writers of the post-war West, Camus took literary and ideological positions which were typical of a whole social stratum—the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia of the capitalist West with all its intrinsic contradictions in matters of world outlook, ideology and politics. Albert Camus, a great talent, has been able to give a particularly vivid and faithful reflection of them all in his books.

Camus and other writers and artists who shared his ideas, joined the Resistance during the Second World

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 86.

War, and there was profound logic in the fact. As convinced anti-fascists and true intellectuals and humanists they could not have taken the "side of the concentration camps".

Human history has not known a worse enemy of thought and culture than fascism. The persecution of people started with the persecution of thought. The bonfires of books were the forerunner of the conflagration of war that swept across Europe after 1939. The acrid smoke of fires and death-camp furnaces dispelled the illusions of those who until then had hoped to stand above the fight and who had pointedly held themselves aloof from politics and ideology. The lessons of history, the lessons of life are the best lessons and the most convincing, even though people have to learn them the hard way.

Camus's *The Plague*, one of his major literary contributions to the common struggle against fascism, had an unmistakable topical political message. The author himself stated that the dominant theme of *The Plague* is resistance to nazism. Already in this novel the shrewd insights and misconceptions of a great writer, the power of his talent and limitations of his petty-bourgeois outlook were in an intricate tangle, as were his anti-historicism and the pessimism of his social thinking. To Camus, the plague symbolizes the tragedy of life, the absurdity of human existence and historical process in general. This social pessimism of Camus found its complete expression in his interpretation of the classical myth of Sisyphus.

The hopeless and tragic myth which symbolizes the absurdity of human existence, the eternal condemnation of man to senseless work, the labour of Sisyphus, is opposed by the heroic figure of Prometheus, symbolizing the eternal burning of the human heart, the indomitable spirit of human thought and the courage of action in the name of man, the maker of history in which the past, the present and the future are inseparable.

Men live not only by the past or in the here and now of the present. They also live with hopes for the future. The optimistic meaning of human existence lies precisely in the fact that in looking back in thought

and sentiment on what has gone before, what is no longer subject to the influence of time and belongs entirely to history, in relying on the past history, while devoting their strength to the present, men build the structure of their future. The realization that his unique, individual destiny is part of the human race and world history, that the products of his honest work, his daily concerns and cares and his personal courage benefit his fellow-men, that the efforts of millions of human beings like himself have erected the edifice of civilization which is now being improved and remodelled along the lines of social justice, that the sacrifices made in the name of life on Earth have not been in vain, this realization fills the individual with a sense of optimism and helps him see the profound philosophical meaning of human existence.

Each man is captive to time. Time sets limits to the length of human life but not to the greatness of his deeds. The end of a human life does not put an end to the products of his thought and labour when alive, and the products may live forever since the course of human history is irreversible and each new generation of men cannot exist, work and move on without drawing on what has been achieved and gained by their predecessor.

"Respect for man! Respect for man! This is the true touchstone."¹

These lines have been taken from Saint-Exupéry's *Letter to the Hostage*, the writer's appeal to each of the forty million Frenchmen and Frenchwomen during World War II. The letter is in the nature of an ideological and literary manifesto of "abstract humanism" to which many of the progressive intellectuals in the West subscribe. This letter exposes the positive and weak points of abstract humanism.

On the one hand, this is a humanistic appeal for respect for man, also a democratic appeal which calls upon people to fight for the honour and dignity of man, an appeal to rise to the defense of human rights and freedoms which are trampled upon in capitalist society. On the other hand, the *Letter* gives a good idea of

the limited nature and inconsistency of abstract humanism. Any attempts to stand above classes and parties in a class-divided society are utopia since "the dough" (the human substance, in Saint-Exupéry's phrase), rises with the help of different social yeasts.

This shows that one cannot approach abstract humanism in the abstract. In each specific individual case and situation one has to try and see its real social content and political thrust, one has to analyze the individual situation in depth to identify the position and interest of different classes before giving an accurate assessment of the meaning of the phenomenon in question. This, also, is the way to take into account the complex nature of social scepticism.

Abstract humanism which is so characteristic of a sizable proportion of the progressive intelligentsia in the West is anti-monopoly in nature and for this reason has a general democratic character. Under certain conditions it may be the transitional phase to an active struggle against capitalism and the introduction to active political struggle of the working class, broad popular masses, it may lead to vigorous social action. However, because of its petty-bourgeois class content, abstract humanism cannot provide social guidelines and sign-posts in complex political situations which call for a clear-cut attitude to matters of class struggle and world outlook. And experience shows that some representatives of the progressive intelligentsia, despite the democratic content of their activity, proved, regretfully, incapable of taking their bearing in complex political situations. They rose to the bait of imperialist propaganda, failed to see through its insinuations and intrigues, and eventually had to overcome, with great difficulty, the crisis situations in their spiritual evolution.

It is also important to see the political difference between the abstract humanism of the democratic intelligentsia of the West and the right-wing revisionist concepts of the so-called "socialism with a human face" which has nothing to do with either socialism or humanism. The right-wing revisionists are exploiting the popularity of humanist phraseology and socialist slogans in their struggle against actual humanism of existing socialism.

¹ Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *Oeuvres*, Paris, 1963, p. 402.

By now the basic factors, objective and subjective, are emerging in a fairly clear focus. These factors contribute to the development of revolutionary-democratic trends in the consciousness of the intellectuals as a result of which a growing segment of the intelligentsia is gravitating towards scientific ideology, towards Marxism-Leninism as they come to see the class interests of the working class as being in harmony with their own interests and aspirations.

One has to bear in mind the rapidly growing social differentiation within the intelligentsia which splits it into different segments: one segment coalesces with the state-monopoly apparatus, merging with the ruling class, the other becomes the victim of capitalist exploitation.

These processes are reflected in the consciousness and the socio-political position of the scientific and technical personnel although the degree of adequacy of their consciousness to the new social status and to the change in their social role is often fairly uneven. It is not easy to identify in the case of different groups of the scientific and technical intelligentsia since they feature a complex and wide spectrum of socio-political moods and attitudes.

Important changes are occurring in the position of the artistic community in the West due to the fact that the main product of spiritual production in the capitalist world is increasingly mass-culture. The strengthening of the state-monopoly tendencies in the spiritual life of capitalist society, the omnipotence of the mass media at the service of monopoly capital which call the tune in the market of ideas combine to narrow down still further the sphere of free creative activity for the artistic and literary community even compared with the limited opportunities and rights it used to enjoy in the free competition society of the pre-monopoly capitalist era. By virtue of its social status, professional activity, the close involvement with science, knowledge and culture, the intelligentsia reacts particularly sensitively to any social injustice and police arbitrariness, and this makes it a natural ally of the working class in the struggle for radical democratic change, for socialism.

The objective processes which characterize the chang-

ing position of the intelligentsia in the capitalist society of today cannot but affect its consciousness and perception of the world and thus prepare the ground for the introduction of the intelligentsia to the socialist ideas and the communist ideals of the working class. However, objective prerequisites by themselves are of course not enough to ensure a thorough assimilation of scientific ideology. The proliferation of pseudo-Marxist, including left-wing, currents characteristic of the intellectual life of capitalist society illustrate the complexity and contradictory nature of this process. This makes it particularly important to implement consistently the Leninist principles of ideological activity which presuppose an ability to approach the needs of intelligentsia in a comradely way, to have an intimate understanding of the specific problems that worry the intelligentsia, to see them as problems that spring from the very nature of spiritual production and the delicate creative activity. This calls for an ability to see not only and not so much the illusions and misconceptions in the minds of the intelligentsia which have been produced by its way of life and special features of its professional activity but also everything that is positive and helpful in its consciousness and activity.

Needless to say, the long-established traditions of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois world outlook still shape the mentality and attitudes of a large proportion of the intellectual community in the capitalist countries. This coupled with their social heterogeneity, makes it difficult for them to assimilate Marxism as an integral comprehensive world outlook and philosophy. It is important to stress, however, that these are the problems and difficulties that are encountered on the way to a new world outlook, and that this road passes through battlefields of uncompromising struggle between polarized ideas. Of special importance for the intelligentsia in this context are the moral and ethical aspects of social theories. Not surprisingly, intellectuals are attracted to Marxism-Leninism on account, among other things, of its profoundly humanistic social ideology and socialist practice. This is one of the many specific elements in the intelligentsia's perception of and approach to Marxism-Leninism.

CONCLUSION

The discovery of sociological laws which determine the general conditions of the origin, development and strengthening of ideology is one of Marxism's historic contributions to human thought. The development of the materialistic interpretation of history made possible the scientific examination of ideological relations and demonstrated that they are shaped by the social being, retaining at the same time a large measure of independence in their internal development.

Ideology as a specific social phenomenon is a form of investigating social reality, a form of awareness by a particular class of its overall tasks and interests, of identifying a programme of action. A progressive ideology contains a blueprint of the future in one form or another. Within the framework of ideologies a particular class evolves from "a class in itself" into a "class for itself", a particular class comes together in cohesion and embraces definite ideological principles which find material realization in a definite form of political organization.

Originally, ideology emerged as an illusory consciousness which is what today's bourgeois sociologists and revisionists invariably seize upon as a justification for their absolute opposition between ideology and science in an attempt to reduce the entire history of ideology and any ideology to what they describe as "non-true" consciousness. This trend has gained momentum with the advances of the scientific and technological revolution,

now that the importance of scientific knowledge in all human endeavour has grown immeasurably. This development has begun to be exploited by the revisionists and bourgeois ideologists for the purpose of negating ideology. However, ideologies have yet not had their day. The concept of de-ideologization became a dead letter in the early 1970s as the dominant ideological doctrine of bourgeois ideology and has since been replaced by a variety of "re-ideologization" concepts.

The scientific-cognitive, socially-organizing and socially-orienting roles of ideology find adequate expression in the scientific, socialist ideology of the working class. And more profound the cognitive role of socialist ideology, the greater its social function. This is determined by the socio-political positions of the working class, by the specific features of the development of socialism as a social system which is the product of the conscious creativity of millions.

The Marxist social analysis has solved the problem of the illusory consciousness, established the social and gnoseological conditions under which the reflection of social being in ideology assumes mystified forms, and disclosed the dialectics of the objective and subjective in ideologies. It has thus demonstrated that ideology is an indispensable social indicator of social relations and trends of historical development.

The border line between science and ideology in the process of historical development, far from being absolute, is relative. The dilemma "science or ideology" put forward by bourgeois sociologists is artificial and has no basis in fact. It does not spring, contrary to what bourgeois sociologists claim, from the objective course of the current scientific and technological revolution but has been brought about in response to considerations which lie outside the realm of scientific knowledge.

A comparison of the inner workings of bourgeois and socialist ideologies indicates the existence of correlative dependence between the character of ideology and type of propaganda. The substantive goals of ideological activity determine the methods and techniques of influencing the minds of the target audience.

The regressive character of bourgeois ideology is matched by the manipulative techniques it employs to in-

fluence the target audience, which is the best proof of its inherent weakness and lack of real content. Ideas and views shaped by means of manipulation cannot live long. They crumble on contact with reality giving rise to crisis situations in social consciousness. Bourgeois propaganda, despite its impressive technical facilities and advanced manipulatory techniques, has no future to look forward to on the time-scale of human history because it does not hold water when confronted with facts, with the dominant trends of the social progress of mankind.

Socialist propaganda has rich content in scientific ideology and aims at securing a development of social consciousness which would be adequate to the scientific knowledge of social laws. This is its basic principle. By according primacy to the substance of the matter, socialist ideology takes fully into account the real place and significance of the socio-psychological aspects of ideological activity.

The active position in ideological activity springs from the revolutionary-critical essence of socialist ideology and is determined by the creative nature of the socialist system which, at the high levels of its maturity, does not become a complete ready-made system but is a living organism developing further, overcoming problems and difficulties which are natural and inevitable. Complex elements, interdependence and interconnection of different elements of social structure, the interaction of economic, socio-political, scientific and technical and spiritual and cultural factors are playing an increasingly important role in the life of this organism. At the same time, the ideological aspects of the rapidly developing social processes are acquiring greater importance.

Ideological work as a target-oriented substantive activity is both a science and a political art. As a department of scientific knowledge it investigates economic, socio-political and spiritual phenomena, the objective logic of social processes and of the laws governing social consciousness and social psychology. As a political art it calls for an intimate knowledge of the practical aspects of life, political intuition and adequate pedagogical and professional skills. Finally, the effectiveness of ideological work depends on how well the people involved in it understand the substance and specific nature

of what they are doing, on the realistic assessment of what can be achieved, on the unmistakable choice of the form and method of propaganda to be used in each individual case to influence social development, on the ability of the propagandists to make full use of the powerful organizing potential inherent in the ideas they propagandize.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to
17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

ИБ № 8508

Редактор русского текста Э. Н. Орлова
Контрольный редактор Д. В. Беляевский
Художник И. В. Борисова
Художественный редактор С. Е. Матвеева
Технический редактор О. Н. Черкасова

Сдано в набор 27.11.79.
Подписано в печать 27.03.80.
Формат 84×108¹/₃₂. Бумага типографская № 1.
Гарнитура обыкновенная. Печать высокая.
Услови. печ. л. 10,92. Уч.-изд. л. 11,48.
Тираж 11000 экз. Заказ № 0575.
Цена 1 р. Изд. № 29017.

Издательство «Прогресс» Государственного
комитета СССР по делам издательств,
полиграфии и книжной торговли.
Москва, 119021, Зубовский бульвар, 17

Ордена Трудового Красного Знамени
Московская типография № 7 «Искра революции»
Союзполиграфпрома Государственного
Комитета СССР по делам издательств,
полиграфии и книжной торговли.
Москва 103001, Трехпрудный пер., д. 9.